THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXXVI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 17 NUMBER 1237

General Miaja's Difficulties

Last week we hailed the Loyalist push across the Ebro as the first Loyalist offensive possessing a far-reaching strategic objective; this week we have even more reason to praise a truly masterly military conception, for while the Ebro drive has compelled Franco to divert troops from the Valencia front to meet the threat to his communications, General Miaja, in the south, has attacked in the direction Albarracin-Teruel. A glance at the map will show that if both Teruel and Gandesa fell into Loyalist hands, Franco's entire army on the Mediterranean would be in deadly peril, being left with wholly inadequate communications either for its supply and reinforcement or for its withdrawal. Unfortunately, our fears for the flimsiness of pontoon bridges under air attack have proved but too well founded. The northern drive has lost momentum and Franco has managed, despite his serious shortage of infantry, to scrape up an army maneuver to counter-attack in this sector. Miaja's advance on Teruel is reported progressing very slowly, stopping to consolidate each gain. If the operation turns out to be but another chapter in war's long history of lost opportunities, it will be testimony to the difficulty of assuming the offensive with troops and staffs trained for defensive tactics. But the outcome is yet in doubt, and Franco's drive for Valencia is for the moment at a standstill.

Recovery—Interim Report

At last the tendency to recovery, moderate though it is, has become firmly enough established to show in the major statistics. Of course everyone knew the stock market had risen consistently—by the end of July stocks of leading companies had recovered about 40 percent of the drop from their highs in 1937 to their lows early this spring. Now the Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production is known to have advanced from 76 in May to 77 in June and 80 in July. According to the Federal Reserve Bulletin, residential building is continuing the rise begun earlier in the year—though commercial and industrial building lags. Retail sales showed less drop than usual in the summer. Inventories are smaller in automobiles, steel, textiles and other lines. Commodity prices of raw and semi-finished goods, having declined from their speculative peak in 1937, are rising slightly, while prices of finished goods have fallen, so that the two elements of the price structure are about in the same relationship as in 1934 and 1935. Over against these favorable factors must be set the decline of 10 percent in employment under last year and the fact that farm cash income is about one-eighth smaller than in 1937. Almost all authorities agree that recovery will continue in the fall, but whether it will be strong and relatively lasting will depend on whether there is a resumption of new investment in building and other capital goods.

Refugees

We now know the staggering size of the refugee problem. Myron C. Taylor, the United States' spokesman at the congress of twenty-seven nations assembled in London to study the plight of the refugees and to search for a solution to their difficulties, says that 660,-

CONTENTS

The Week 29

Editorials
- The Bear Shows His Claws 31
- Divided, Labor Falls 32
- Primaries Mean Little 33

General Articles
- Three Men in a Valley . Jonathan Daniels 34
- Captain of Industry (verse) . . . . . LeGarde S. Doughty 37
- Paris Parades . . . . . Louis Gibarti 38
- The Marx-Engels Partnership . Edmund Wilson 40
- Population Problems . . . Harold Ward 44
- Shoot the Works . . . Heywood Broun 45
- Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 46
- Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 47
- Red and Mildred (Cont'd) . Otis Ferguson 48
- The Bandwagon 49

Correspondence 49

Books in Review
- National Card-Index . . John Chamberlain 52
- Napoleon's Europe . . . Solomon Bloom 53
- Fast Black and a Yard Wide . Fred R. Miller 53
- Proust, Gide and Others . Norma McCarty 54
- The House of Krupp . . . Quincy Howe 54
- British Imperialism in India . Taraknath Das 55
- Forest Primeval . . . . . Raphael Zon 55
- New Books: A Reader's List 56

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

900 people now in Germany and Austria must find homes in other countries immediately. This figure, based on the most recent investigations, is about 150,000 greater than any previous estimate. Yet it does not include persons more than fifty years old, and it ignores the hundreds of thousands who may need to emigrate from Poland, Hungary or Italy in the near future. About 300,000 of the 660,900 are Jews; the rest are "non-Aryan" Christians and Roman Catholics. The immensity of the problem must have shocked the delegates and made obvious the fact that the resettlement of these hundreds of thousands cannot be achieved without full coöperation from each of the twenty-seven participating nations. None of the delegates, however, was willing to commit his government to any share in the burden with the exception of Mr. Taylor who announced the United States' agreement to take its full regular quota of 27,000 this year from Germany and Austria.

If the refugee problem is to be solved, it will require more than a willingness on the part of foreign countries to accept the homeless. The German government will have to coöperate, at least to the extent of letting emigrees take property away with them. On the contrary, Hitler has made it more difficult for them to do so. Formerly Jews going abroad were allowed to take movable possessions with them, although not much money. Now there is a 100-percent export tax on such possessions. Jews cannot sell their belongings in Germany because professional dealers are not allowed to bid at auction for Jewish property and private bidders dare not. When property has twice been offered at auction unsuccessfully it is confiscated by the state.

"Go in Shooting"

Use of violence in the steel strikes of a year ago has been the special concern of the La Follette Senate Civil Liberties Committee in its most recent hearings. Earlier in the course of the investigation testimony was taken on the steel companies' attempts to smash the union by capturing the newspapers in the steel towns, by organizing "back-to-work" movements, by promoting phoney "independent" unions, by seeking sanction from the pulpit and by maintaining an extensive spy system. Now the Committee is down to the hard facts of the steel battles: who shot whom and on whose orders?

It is not hard to understand the high lists of casualties the steel strikes have chalked up when one reads the testimony of Ray L. Thomas, attorney for the Republic Steel and Youngstown Sheet and Tube company unions and a leading spirit in their "back-to-work" drives. Mr. Thomas reported that he had armed the employees with revolvers and guns and advised them to "go in shooting" through the picket lines, if necessary. He said he had thought the matter over in advance and that the "loyal" workers had a perfect right to shoot down anyone who tried to keep them out of the mill. Youngstown's Sheriff Ralph Elser, on the witness stand, expressed his regret at having followed the suggestion of the company union to swear in a couple of its men as deputy sheriffs. One of the deputies turned out to have an extensive criminal record. The deputies testified that they were armed with "small bombs, but not very strong ones. Just about strong enough to blow up a porch." Contradictory accounts of the battles at the Market Street Bridge, Youngstown, and at "Stop Five," Youngstown, were given by the local police and by the strikers. But in the case of the latter riot, in which two men were killed and thirty-six wounded, it is significant that all but five of the injured were strikers. Despite the record of two strikers killed and thirty-one wounded, the police insist they fired nothing but tear gas.

Censoring a Scientist

When Hoover was President, an elaborate report on "Recent Social Trends" was published. The experts who wrote the section on population trends wanted to include a discussion of the influence of birth control, but were persuaded against their will to leave it out for political reasons. As a result, for years this volume was used by enemies of the birth-control movement to show that it was of so little importance it was not even discussed in a supposedly comprehensive scientific study. Now, something disturbingly similar seems to have happened. The National Resources Committee has recently issued an excellent volume, "Problems of a Changing Population" (discussed by Harold Ward on page 44 of this issue). As originally prepared, the manuscript contained a careful discussion of the influence of contraception on varying birth rates in different sections of the population. It was the work of Dr. Clyde V. Kiser, a well known authority in this field who, needless to say, discussed the subject in an impartial and completely factual manner.

The July issue of Population Index, the official organ of the Population Association of America, contains a statement by Dr. Frank W. Notestein, one of its editors, and a member of the faculty of Princeton University, that Dr. Kiser's material had been heavily cut, so heavily as to change the scope and distort the original presentation. "The change was made without the knowledge of the author, whose article was contributed at the request of the Committee and without salary. Dr. Kiser is informed by the Technical Director of the study that the change was made without his knowledge and without consulting the full membership of the Committee on Population Problems." In other words: somebody, for political reasons purely, has so altered a scientific study as to make it and everyone connected with it seem ridiculous. The change.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholic Church. But neither the Catholic Church nor anyone else can profit, in the long run, by pretending that things don't exist when they do.

The Assault on WNYC

One of the most interesting radio broadcasting stations in the United States is station WNYC, owned and operated by the City of New York. Although its annual budget is tiny compared with that of the commercial stations, it puts on the air an astonishingly large amount of good material, and it is free from the incessant whine of the advertiser which causes so many people to refuse to listen to the big networks. WNYC has not always been as good as it is today; a few months ago it took a sharp upward turn, following a change in its status through the new city charter and the appointment of a new director, Morris S. Novik, who had made a brilliant achievement at another New York station, WEVD. In fact, WNYC's excellence may prove its undoing. Tammany Hall and its allied machines in other boroughs strongly object to a good station that will broadcast interesting material and will tell the people of New York something about what their government is doing, and might do, for them. The machine politicians have therefore started an "investigation" of WNYC, authorization having been jammed through the City Council some time ago. Ostensibly, the purpose is to inquire into "radicalism" but this is nonsense, as usual. Actually, Tammany is trying to destroy the station by cutting it down to broadcasts of routine information to which nobody would listen. Tammany leaders care nothing for good music, good drama or other broadcasts of a high level. They don't want the voters to have their culture enriched; the better educated a citizen is, the less he is likely to have anything to do with Tammany.

News Notes of a Week

While the world held its breath last week, fearing action by Hitler against Czechoslovakia that would mean war, Viscount Runciman was busy in Prague. Presumably he was attempting the almost impossible task of persuading the Czechs into concessions large enough to satisfy the insatiable Germans. . . . Vigorous counter-attacks by the Chinese held up the Japanese advance on Hankow; Canton was bombed again at a cost of scores of lives. . . . Japan's dwindling resources for foreign trade were indicated in another shipment of gold to the United States; the total sent us in sixteen months is about $352,000,000. . . . Mexico, as might have been expected, gave a stiff reply to the United States' note on the expropriation of American-owned farm land. The Mexican government refuses to recognize any valid claim for compensation under international law. She will pay for the land because her own laws require it, but she refuses to be hurried, Malcolm MacDonald, British Dominion Secretary, flew to Palestine on a secret mission, giving rise to reports that some new compromise proposal between Jews and Arabs might be in the wind.

At home, the political quarrel in Pennsylvania continued to deepen. A Harrisburg judge rejected the laws written in a hasty special session of the State Legislature for the purpose of stopping a Grand Jury investigation of state officials. . . . Harry Hopkins, head of the WPA, suggested that Southern sharecroppers should be aided through federal relief projects to help keep them alive during the slack season.

The Bear Shows His Claws

As THE border incident which has caused trouble between the USSR and Japan develops, it becomes apparent that for some reason the Soviet Union is forcing the issue, and making it necessary either for Japan to back down, with loss of face, or to fight. One can only speculate as to the cause of this attitude, but the speculations are interesting.

On technical diplomatic grounds, the Soviet Union's position is unassailable. She is protecting only what she believes to be her territory, and has firmly denied any intention of encroaching upon Manchukuo or Korea. When Japan claimed and seized part of this territory, Moscow produced a map demarking the frontier, which was part of the Hunchung agreement between Russia and China, made long before Japan appeared on the scene. Since Japan has been the illegal interloper so far, it would hardly be expected that she could have as authentic information regarding the boundary as did Moscow. When Japan, in an effort to maintain peace, suggested that both sides withdraw from the disputed localities while a commission fixed the boundary line, Litvinov replied quite properly that there was no agreement that could supersede the existing treaty and map. A bi-partisan commission might survey the ground to determine where the legally established line ran, but could not change it. If, before that time, Japan wanted to avoid trouble, she could withdraw her troops from Russian soil and cease her attacks upon it.

Unexceptionable as this logic is, it is in tone and effect firmer than necessary in dealing with a friendly power, and especially with an Oriental one to which "face" is a primary consideration. The Soviet Union has in fact given the Japanese plenty of excuse for a war if they want one, and it will be a clear admission that the latter regard Blucher's Siberian army as too formidable to tackle, under the present circumstances, if they meekly surrender. There are a number of possible explanations for this attitude on the part of Moscow.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintained the position that the way to preserve world peace is not to be afraid of aggressors or to back down when they become menacing. Formerly, this policy of hers has required the coöperation of other powers such as Britain or France in order to be effective, and they have consistently hung back. This time she is acting alone, and it was only natural to expect that she would give a demonstration in force to show Japan that she is resolute, strong and united, and will surrender nothing, however small in importance it may be, without a fight. This attitude in itself may help to stiffen backbones in London, Paris and Prague as well as in the Far East. If successful, it will restore to the Soviet Union some badly needed prestige in diplomatic and military circles, and may give pause to Hitler in his action regarding Czechoslovakia.

It has also been suggested that the Soviet Union has deliberately picked the present as the most favorable time to settle her score with Japan. Everyone knows that the ambitions of the Japanese military are boundless; that they certainly intend sooner or later to seize at least the eastern part of Siberia. But they want to digest North China first. At the moment they are seriously embarrassed and would be far more easily defeated than later. If the Soviet Union could be sure that no hostilities would break out on her western frontier, this would be the ideal time to check Japan. If she is indeed forcing the issue for this purpose, it means that she is morally certain there will be no war in Europe in 1938. And if she fights Japan and wins, Germany might find her too strong to attack later.

Less sensational than this would be an intention on the part of the USSR to help China beat off the Japanese assault without herself becoming actively engaged in the war. By frowning fiercely enough on her own frontier without letting Japan know exactly what her own ultimate intentions are, the Soviet Union could immobilize enough Japanese troops to make Chiang Kai-shek's task easier, and could send him more supplies and other help without fearing that the Japanese would attempt to intercept them.

The possibility that the border incidents have been caused by the excessive zeal of local military men on either side need not be excluded from these calculations. It is the use of them made in Moscow that is important. And there can be no doubt that Litvinov was delivering a serious warning, not necessitated by the immediate friction, when he said to Ambassador Shigemitsu, after discussing the specific incidents in question, that the Russian government does not intend to limit itself to new protests against violations of the frontier, but is "determined in similar cases in the future to resort to the most drastic measures, including use of artillery and aviation." The world is thus put on notice that the Soviet Union is not afraid

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other organization involving human beings. The CIO

Divided, Labor Falls

THE PRESS lately has printed more news about dissension within the ranks of labor than about struggles between workers and employers. The fight in the United Automobile Workers between President Homer Martin and what he describes as the Communist opposition is well known. The fur workers in New York have just been through a bitter quarrel in which an opposition described as "Lovestoneite" won a substantial minority of the votes. The National Maritime Union on the East Coast has also been split, four of nine positions in the union going to a group characterized by its opponents as Communists. On the Pacific Coast, trouble has broken out in several directions. The Sailors' Union of the Pacific has voted to rejoin the American Federation of Labor and has received a charter that will bring it into conflict with the National Maritime Union. Four important unions in Los Angeles, all members of the CIO, have voted to withdraw from the Industrial Union Council, headed by Harry Bridges of the NMU. They have set out a solemn list of nine charges against Mr. Bridges, which boil down into acting as a dictator and favoring the Communists.

Some of these developments, to be sure, are subject to some discount. One of the four groups to withdraw from the Los Angeles Industrial Union Council is the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, whose national head is David Dubinsky. While the ILGWU is still nominally in the CIO, Mr. Dubinsky has been sulking in his tent for many months, and no one would have been surprised to see the union withdraw long ago. Press dispatches say that he is behind the action in Los Angeles. Another group to repudiate Bridges' leadership is the United Automobile Workers, which, as indicated, is engaged in a "Red purge" throughout the country. The others are the rubber and shoe workers. The total number of persons involved in the four unions is comparatively small, being only about 20,000.

Behind such factional disputes within the CIO stands the menacing division between that body and the American Federation of Labor. It has often been charged that President William Green of the A. F. of L. is prepared to destroy the American labor movement rather than see the leadership pass into other hands than his own and recent events lend color to this statement. He is quoted as having told Maury Maverick that the A. F. of L. would fight him in San Antonio solely because he had shown friendship toward the CIO.

As for the fights within various CIO unions, no doubt they were inevitable. Struggles for power have always gone on in labor unions as they have in every

000, many of whom had previously been unorganized. We need not take too seriously the notion that certain leaders are being displaced because they are Communists or Trotskyists or Socialists or Tories. If these convenient excuses had not appeared, no doubt others would have been found. We do not deny that these ideological differences exist and seem important to the individuals concerned. We do deny, however, that they have anything to do with the wise and efficient guidance of a labor union, or that there is any sound reason why partisans of the various sects should not work side by side and harmoniously.

For after all, it is not fellow workers of a different persuasion who are the real enemy, but the employers. In spite of everything, American industry is still predominantly anti-union. While some progress has been made, there are far too many employers who welcome a schism within a union as a device to help them crush the union itself. The factional fighters might well pause and consider. Is it worth while to turn their brothers out of the room even at the risk of losing the house over their heads?

Primaries Mean Little

THE DAILY PRESS continues to comment on the lengthening series of primary elections in terms of its own prejudices. Conservative papers, for example, exult openly when an opponent of the President's policies wins a Democratic nomination, saying the people have risen against the New Deal. But when, on the other hand, a supporter of the President wins, it is his personality, or the result of machine pressure, or "wholesale bribery by the WPA."

On whichever side they are used, such explanations seem to us too simple. There are many factors in a local election, and no outsider (and perhaps not even people on the scene) can say with authority which one is decisive. An electorate which is heartily in favor of the President might choose for the Senate, or some other office, a man not altogether in sympathy with him, whose attitude on other matters seemed desirable; and, of course, the reverse might be true. There are crooked political machines functioning in all parts of the United States, in both the major parties, grinding out votes for their candidates as machines have always done. In Missouri, the highly corrupt Pendergast gang in Kansas City operated in behalf of anti-New Deal Senator Clark; in Tennessee, the equally corrupt Crump machine of Memphis helped defeat George L. Berry, who had been increasingly opposed to the Roosevelt policies in recent months. In Kentucky, Senator Alvin Barkley has won a thumping victory over Governor "Happy" Chandler. Barkley received the most glowing of Mr. Roosevelt's eulogies during his recent transcontinental tour; yet the victory seems to have been by approximately the margin indicated in a poll of the Institute of Public Opinion long before the President had set foot on Kentucky's dark and bloody soil. One wonders whether his visit changed very many votes. The Tory press rejoiced when William E. Dodd Jr., was defeated for the House of Representatives in Virginia. But Mr. Dodd had no organization, money or experience and was hardly known in the district where he maintained his legal residence. If he had won, it would have been a political miracle. Just across the border in West Virginia, six supporters of the New Deal all won handily.

Every student of politics expects the Republicans to win a substantial number of seats in the House this fall, and a few in the Senate. Such a swing is seen in practically every mid-term election in the United States, and especially after such an overwhelming victory as that of 1936. There is no reason to believe, however, that the Democrats will lose control of either branch of the national Legislature. As for President Roosevelt's personal popularity, it continues to be at least six of the seven wonders of the world. While it fluctuates from time to time, it never has fallen anywhere near the dangerous level of 50 percent.

The real unanswered question is what the Democrats in Congress will do to the President's program during the remaining two years of his term. He has in the past been defeated on an ominously large number of issues, a fact partly concealed by the new attitude of the Supreme Court. It is far too early to make guesses as to what the next session will do to the Roosevelt program; and indeed the answer does not lie wholly or even chiefly in the results of this summer's primary elections. It lies first of all in the vigor and skill with which the President fights for the things in which he believes, and the degree to which the people of the country, regardless of their technical political affiliation, support him.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1938,
IN THE U. S., BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC.,
40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK

Editors
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG
Assistant Editors: OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING
Contributing Editors
H. N. BRAILSFORD HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD R. G. TUGWELL
Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE
E. G. WOOD *Advertising Manager*
BYRON DEXTER *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO NNSOC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Three Men in a Valley[1]

COME SUNDAY, any Sunday, through the pretty town of Norris down the green freeway where, in the throat of the valley of the Clinch, Norris Dam sits, smooth and white and high. There every such day the cars are parked side by side in every permitted space from the fish pools below the powerhouse to the high overlook where one American can look down upon his fellows stirring like proud ants over every part of this high monument to order and conservation and power which his TVA has made for him. Almost as thick as the cars are the pleasure boats on Norris Lake behind the long floating boom which keeps them from going down with the waters by Chattanooga and Florence and Paducah to the Mississippi and the sea. Within the powerhouse, simple seeming almost as the dashboards of the Chevrolets and Fords outside, the two big turbines turn like tops grown Gargantuan in these hills, and Americans look at them, quiet in the spell of their huge turning quietness. As surely as electricity moves over the transmission lines, wonder and a sense of pride in a working democracy goes out across the land to America. Here is the picture of the TVA which the TVA likes best. And no wonder: like a set for a great drama, loveliness and power and people all are at their best here together.

But not all of the long Tennessee Valley is Sunday afternoon at Norris Dam. Go only half a dozen blocks from the big offices of the TVA on Union Street in Knoxville where experts and administrators from Illinois and Wisconsin and Ontario sit like Southerners in their shirt sleeves in the Southern heat, and look down from the Hill Avenue Bridge over the unkempt gully of First Creek which trickles a little way below into the Little Tennessee. There is slum.

It sits for seeing below the windows of the big Andrew Johnson Hotel, only a block or two from the William Blount Mansion preserved to show the good living which in some cases existed in Tennessee even in 1792. But neither Tennessee nor the TVA has transformed this slum. Look down on top of the houses and the heads. There was water power here once, too, and the creek moves sluggishly past the old dam of a disappeared planing mill. Children are throwing dish water from porches into short and squalid Lane Street. Negroes, more vigorous-looking than the white inhabitants of the row, are working on a clogged sewer which is overflowing into the street and in the overflow very little children are wading. An old man in overalls is sitting still as a stone on the low wall before a house, and an old woman and a girl are taking down clothes from a wash line on the edge of hopeful little householders' gardens in which corn and cabbages grow between Lane Street and First Creek. There are old oil cans for garbage, many babies, at least one pregnant woman, chickens and a whole family of cats.

Other people have had better luck. The Sallsworths in Grainger County have been chosen by the TVA and by their neighbors to operate their farm as a demonstration place where all may see how the knowledge of the TVA and the phosphates of the TVA send their acres up from the hollyhocks by the farmhouse to the high ridge—all the way a secure, green, uneroded strip, dramatic beside the farm next door where stunted corn and red gully mark disuse. But it was while we looked in approving—even patriotic—pleasure at the Sallsworth hillside that a young Sallsworth, buck-toothed and freckled, told us about the cows.

"They're dead," he reported.

"Dead?" demanded William Landess of the TVA.

"Yessuh," he grinned over the telling of tragedy. "Sister left some arsenate of lead in a poke in the barn. They et it."

And not all the phosphates, not all the cover crops, not all the terracing, not all the power and planning, not all the wise men from the TVA can save farming from such carelessness of Sisters which in an irreverent and evasive world must be set down as Acts of God. Cheap power for the people, as has been discovered, will run sweatshops paying cheap wages. Even the best and wisest men cannot always agree as to what constitutes wisdom and righteousness—not even in the Tennessee Valley Authority, which in five years has spent $200,000,000 in demonstrating for a nation, despite the screaming opposition of the utilities, what the integrated development of land and stream may mean for a valley.

Such screaming delayed the creation of the TVA; it has harassed the TVA in its development, but not even utility men believe that the present investigation will turn up any Teapot Dome or disclose any Little Black Bag. The present investigation may serve, by overemphasizing quarrels within the TVA directorate and adding it to the old quarreling harassment of the utilities, as a help in the continuing effort to deliver the TVA over to that reaction which had been waiting to kill it at the first, last and every opportunity since the TVA idea was born. But, fortunately for the TVA, that chance is slim. A man said to me in Tennessee this summer: "In a few months contracts running over thirty years for power will be signed and not even a reactionary Congress can repeal a contract—or dams—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the provision of material for political oratory but also in terms of the public welfare by assembling the material for the thoughtful judgment of the country on the TVA and by making the country aware that the TVA is not merely a power company owned by the government but an agency devoted to the development of a whole river valley in terms of public safety, public convenience and public welfare for this present and the future before it—a use of a river basin for all which the promoters of power for profit could never even contemplate. The Congressmen may discover mistakes in TVA administration which should be disclosed and rectified. Certainly mistakes have been made in the Valley. They may also disclose the unknown extent to which the war on the TVA by the utilities went beyond the multiplicity of suits in the courts, in propaganda, in elections and, as some suggest, even in puissant friendship and enmity to newspapers. All this will be useful, even if some sought the investigation for a destructive purpose. But the hope of circus went abruptly out of the investigation at its first session when Dr. Arthur Morgan, whom the President had removed for "contumacy," took the stand to say that when he charged his fellow directors with dishonesty he meant not what you and I and the man in the subway had understood but something "more subtle," something, indeed, which sounded like disagreement with him.

And yet if that statement took the hearing from circus status, it also emphasized that in the life of the TVA there has been a story which is not the melodrama of cheap crooks but the high tragedy which may grow from the antagonism of superior men. And I think the unintentional author of this tragedy in the TVA is the President of the United States.

There was a man in Tennessee named John Harcourt Alexander Morgan who had been born in Canada. "In the fertile southwestern corner of Ontario," his TVA biography characteristically states. Though he was an entomologist and came south as such, soil and its fertility were the preoccupations of his life. They still are. He was a teacher not only of college students in the University of Tennessee, of which he was president, but of little farmers all over the South to whom he went preaching the importance of the land.

There was a man in Wisconsin, a young, intellectual Jewish lawyer named David Eli Lilienthal. From Harvard he went to law practice with Donald R. Richberg in Chicago and with Richberg participated in important cases involving the rights of labor. Then in his own right he became special counsel for the city of Chicago in a famous telephone-rate controversy which ultimately resulted in the United States Supreme Court's ordering a refund of a $20,000,000 overcharge to telephone subscribers. At the request of Governor Philip La Follette he reorganized the then Railroad missioner of that state he so revised the public-utility statutes that they became a model for half a dozen other states. Thus he had devoted himself to curbing power and advancing people. And in each he had found it necessary to fight.

The third man was in Yellow Springs, Ohio, at the head of that Antioch College which Horace Mann had founded and to which he had given the last seven years of his life. But when Arthur Ernest Morgan came to it in 1922 it was almost as dead as Horace Mann. He was, he insisted, not educator but engineer (and a great one: he had provided for the protection of Dayton, Ohio, and Pueblo, Colorado, from floods, had directed the drainage of the big St. Francis Valley in Arkansas, and his water and drainage codes had been adopted by half a dozen states). Informally schooled, he had learned from each job, and one significant learning he repeated to the employees of the TVA at a time when his own hope of directing and determining the shaping of a happier Valley had begun to fade. He said: "Years ago with my engineering associates at Memphis I planned and directed the reclamation of many hundred thousand acres of very fertile land. The philosophy of that development was that if you give people the means of creating wealth and comfort they will work out the situation without further help. Yet today that most fertile land in America is the *locus* of the most miserable sharecropper tenantry, where poverty and bitterness are general, and violence appears."

But it was not such a sense of disillusionment in the competency of little men, given a chance, to work out their own welfare that he chiefly took to Antioch. The engineer had a head full of ideas about everything and particularly about college education which he himself had been denied because of poverty and frail health. In management of the college he insisted on a free hand; the trustees gave it to him. And Antioch bloomed. Its steadily increasing number of students alternated between classroom at the college and job in the world. All were close to the lean philosophic president who preached progressive education and opposed the use of tobacco as well as of alcohol. His Quaker wife boarded about forty students at their house all the time. And for the world beyond Antioch Morgan wrote the ideas that packed his long skull in a little college publication called "Antioch Notes," which was read by a great many people far from Yellow Springs, including Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York.

"Here at Antioch," he said that summer when the President gave him the chairmanship of the TVA, "we have been working to create coördinated individuals. But communities can be coördinated, just as individuals can be. I have been preaching that, and I believe that is what interested the President."

Undoubtedly it did. The President appointed Arthur Morgan on May 19, 1933, and sent him to

PROTECTED TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY LAW. ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED.

the innovator, the individualist and the educator, who believed in the possibility of doing new things with old human beings, went to work, vigorously, enthusiastically, with great power and a determination to use it in the most generous terms and always also in the terms of an ethical standard fitted to the new, happy valley he meant to make.

"I want to tell you one thing," he told an old public-ownership man who had spent his life in a fight with the utilities in which no holds were barred. "I am not going to fight the power companies."

Even to the veteran in those happy days, that sounded possibly proper. Dr. Morgan was making a new heaven in an old earth. But while he made it, hiring personnel and shaping grand plans, the President waited more than half a month before he sent to the Senate the names of two other strong men with ideas of their own to be equally responsible with Arthur Morgan in making TVA reality out of TVA law. The three did not meet together until almost a month after Dr. Morgan had been appointed. Then two of them, who met there in the Washington hotel room for the first time, were brought face to face with programs already started.

In that first meeting Arthur Morgan suggested that he should like to be named as general manager of the corporation, to have all the powers which a general manager would have in a private corporation. Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan agreed. But the meeting was by no means entirely satisfactory.

"We were called upon," Harcourt Morgan said long afterwards, "to review great stacks of correspondence, most of which dealt with matters which properly should have been delegated to others after an organization had been set up. In the same meeting, we were asked by Arthur Morgan to approve semi-commitments he had already made as to a number of key personnel. The men in question were already at work."

Thus by the very nature of their positions and the timing of their appointments Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan were thrown together in opposition to Arthur Morgan. Their entrance then served to interrupt Dr. Morgan's full flight. Dr. Harcourt Morgan, Canadian that he was born, came nevertheless with a native Tennessean's suspicion of some of Dr. Morgan's intellectual proposals for the remaking of the Valley and its people. David Lilienthal, from a law practice devoted to fighting and regulating utilities, came with some cynicism as to the possibility of dealing with utilities as with comrades in a new world entitled to complete candor. The cleavage in TVA was prepared before TVA in reality began. And the President did that.

And like a crevice, such as would never appear in any one of TVA's six excellently designed dams, which will serve flood control, navigation, power production, fertilizer making and national defense, this difference among the directors widened into a crevasse. It has let

ness. The same old public-power man who was only slightly disturbed in 1933 when Arthur Morgan told him he did not mean to fight the utilities has recently written a piece, inserted into The Congressional Record by Senator George W. Norris, father of the TVA, in which it is directly suggested that Arthur Morgan has gone over to the side of the utilities and those who believe in company unions. There is talk to the effect that Dr. Morgan was subtly corrupted by the big gifts of the big men who helped him increase the budget of Antioch College from $15,000 to $700,000. Actually his interest in a public-power project at Yellow Springs was used by a local utility to discourage contributions and create a financial crisis at the institution. It is improbable that he has changed. His highly Christian consideration for the utilities is not a new thing. It is a reflection of what he said to the public-power veteran in 1933. He has seemed only to be engaged in providing aid and comfort for the utilities because he has moved in irascible condemnation farther and farther from Lilienthal who at his worst and shrewdest has dealt with the utilities with no less candor than utilities have been accusomed to giving such regulatory bodies as that upon which Lilienthal served in Wisconsin.

The charge that Arthur Morgan has turned his coat to serve the utilities is not made at Knoxville, and in Knoxville the partisans of Dr. Morgan are so few as to be scarcely discoverable. Of course, the Morgan men may be silent in an organization in which Morgan's antagonists are in power. The absence of his supporters, however, seems better accounted for by the fact that while he was removed by the President only in May, 1938, he has actually been out of power since he staked his influence on the issue of Lilienthal's reappointment in May, 1936, and lost. From that point on the other directors have ruled and the twenty-four dissents which he registered in important board votes from the end of May, 1936, to the first of January, 1938, kept the record of his position but showed his impotence.

And in those years there has grown up in the organization a sense of a philosophy which states the TVA in terms of democratic activity as opposed to the paternalistic benevolence which is attributed to Dr. Morgan. Indeed, it is one of the significant aspects of the TVA that up and down the long valley not only executives and experts but policemen and guides speak of democracy as a force and a philosophy which is both important and familiar in their lives. I think the roots of this permeating philosophy grow out of the soil which is getting the phosphates and the legumes of Harcourt Morgan. But the words, the stress, the ubiquitousness of the doctrine seemed somehow to me to come from the office and the head of David Lilienthal.

"It's strange," a man who rode with me down the long valley said. He had not long before been in Ger- many. "I've never noticed it anywhere before in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

talk about democracy with the same solemn but casual devotion as you will get from all sorts of people in Germany about the Nazi program."

It is queer in more ways than one that a Canadian and a Jew, one or both of them together, could make that universally evident understanding and devotion to democracy at the TVA which is unusual in everyday utterance in the United States. And in the TVA it began, I suspect, as a partisan philosophy in a schism. Began is hardly the word. Certainly it was there before that day early in May when Senator George Norris told Lilienthal that Arthur Morgan had told the President that Lilienthal ought not to be reappointed to his job. It was there at the beginning in the man whose faith was in the protection of the rights of workers and consumers in Illinois and Wisconsin and in the man whose faith was in the land and the little men on it in Tennessee. But friction in the TVA lifted their faith like a banner. And certainly it made Dr. Arthur Morgan's isolation more complete. For he was made to seem—and I think he contributed to the seeming—a paternalist directing from a vast ethical and intellectual elevation while Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan appeared as participants in their leadership in a democratic process on the plane with both the experts of the organization and the ordinary folk of the Valley. I think this difference in attitude did exist. In the early TVA days Arthur Morgan suggested in speeches that the laws of land ownership must be changed so that property could be taken away from farmers who misused their land. An entirely opposite attitude was taken by Harcourt Morgan, who knows that there are no more independent men on the earth than the farmers of this valley, and by Lilienthal. They have insisted on the gentler policy of leading and teaching and hoping.

So complex a personality as that of Dr. Arthur Morgan is not to be pinned down in certainty with a generalization about paternalism. But whether it is false or true, he has in Knoxville and Norris been effectually tagged with the label. And in explaining the violence of his antagonism particularly to Lilienthal, the generalization is amplified to make him a paternalist who identifies his own ideas with righteousness and rejection of them with dishonesty.

"He is," somebody said in the TVA offices on Union Street, "a man who would be God. All unconsciously, of course. He is a good man. He determines what he believes to be right but then he is apt to regard as dishonest judgments which differ from his own."

"That's right," another older man agreed. He shook his head. "Still I don't understand him. He's the sort of man you want to put your arm around one minute and kick in the pants the next."

In Knoxville I heard the suggestion that Lilienthal and Harcourt Morgan are not the first who have found it difficult to deal with a mind which, so they say, identifies its thoughts with righteousness. Some of the trustees at Antioch, it was suggested, had some similar difficulties. And a young TVA executive told this story:

When the President was first troubled with the charges of Dr. Morgan against his colleagues which he did not substantiate and for which there seemed to be no substantiation, he decided that his own personal and political peace of mind, the TVA, its directors and the country as a whole might be best served if the trustees at Antioch would formally request Dr. Morgan to resume his presidential duties in Yellow Springs. So the President sent an emissary to Philadelphia to call upon a prominent member of the Antioch College board. This gentleman listened attentively until the presidential suggestion was completely delivered.

Then he said, "You go back to Washington and deliver to the gentleman who lives on Pennsylvania Avenue just this message: 'We had him; you've got him.' "

But beyond that apocryphal tale, the business is sadder than it is funny. It will not provide much in political pickings for politicians in an election year. But, like the arsenate of lead which Sister Sallsworth left for the cows, it does indicate how much all our high plans for a better world depend upon men. The TVA, as David Lilienthal once said, is not figures and blueprints and charts and budgets, but people. And very human from top to bottom they all are. In a world of people even national planning needs a little luck. The Morgan-Morgan-Lilienthal feud has grown, I think, only to private tragedy; it might have been a national calamity if a President's primary error had advanced through personal antagonisms to the destruction of a program which had enemies enough outside without the need of any more within.

JONATHAN DANIELS

Captain of Industry

What narcotic but inertia is this mental calm
Pinking the pouches of your cheeks, imperturbable one?
Can you hear the ten-footed, hundred-footed, thousand-footed alarm
Scuffing concrete outside your embattled bastion?

He was a good blueprintist who designed this honeycombed place.
A burlesque conqueror mounted and loaded its guns:
Paper, document-cannon and pulp percussion-puns.
—But a bastard poet chiseled *Anno Domini* across its face.

What extraordinary food is this that day after day
Pushes your belly closer to the desk and urges your head
Farther back into plush so by angle of vision you may
Look past your obesity and feel unsurfeited?

There's much of subtle idiocy in your anthropoid grace
Maintained cucumber-cool against shuffling unrest—
Indomitable one, God damn the insolence of your face,
And the mad assurance of the plump thumbs hooked in your vest.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paris Parades

THE TRADITIONAL French technique of festivals for the tourist trade has never produced more enchanting colors than those now blossoming out along the great boulevards and the Rond Point of the Champs Elysées. For weeks millions of flags, French and British, have covered the city. Old stone structures dating back to the time of Cardinal Mazarin and the great democratic facades of the nineteenth century are bathed in light. Open-air ballets and operas are performed nightly over lakes seething in the silver fire of spotlights. There are pageants of the cavalry of Louis XIV taking St. Germain and the surrounding chateaux. Broadway producers could take a lesson from the imaginative officials of the "Under-secretariat of the Beaux Arts."

Superficial satire, however, must fall short of the underlying realities of the situation. Spectators may like the parades and festivals, but these were not organized for their exclusive entertainment. There are elements of deeper significance.

It might be mentioned that the French Academy, included for the first time in such festivities, elected to its immortal ranks, by remarkable coincidence and with evident meaning, Charles Maurras and André Maurois. The coincidence cannot be neglected, for Maurras, after decades of chauvinist incitement in impeccable literary form against enemies on the Left, recently developed a pacifist vein. For this reason he opposes the opening of the Spanish frontier to let the Loyalist government receive supplies. And André Maurois, a native of Temesvar, old Hungary, on the other hand, was especially predestined to become the guiding star of British orientation in French letters.

"Non-intervention" and British orientation—these academic gestures point unmistakably to political processes of central importance. They point, for example, to the fact that an important part of the French financial oligarchy, and influential British monopolies with heavy investments in Spain and Germany, are today engaged in a major attack against the Spanish Republic and the French popular front.

The pressure of these forces is tremendous upon French public opinion, which they would subdue into acceptance of final blockade measures against Loyalist Spain, and thus paralyze it on the eve of decisive steps toward the "fascization" of Europe.

Such an analysis of the Paris parades may seem, at first, highly exaggerated. It is not an exaggeration, however, to contend that the royal visit to Paris is effecting a certain popularization of the "Chamberlain policy" and is fostering a disregard of the realities of the European situation. Its effects may be judged after

British monopolies have always wanted a decisive voice in the "advisory council" of Spanish fascism. They prudently held in reserve certain personages, Salvador de Madariaga and Alcala Zamorra, who were destined to appear at the final stage of the Spanish drama. After the Loyalist defeat in Aragon this spring (which was, in essence, the realization of the Moltke plan of the German General Faupel), Chamberlain was anxious to shape his preliminary negotiations with Mussolini into an agreement. This was concluded on April 16. The assumption was that Spain of the popular front was a thing of the past. Chamberlain wanted to remove the Italian troops, and with them serious obstacles to his plans. Mussolini seemingly accepted the removal in return for the further reinforcement of the blockade against the Spanish government and for badly needed loans from the City. It is also reasonable to suppose that bringing the French into line was a condition of the agreement. The outlook seemed fair. All the financial journals of the world were praising the "sane peace policy" of Chamberlain when an unforeseen difficulty arose: the Loyalists refused to accept the gallows of Franco as a token of the all-round peaceful settlement. A new resistance was organized on the Ebro line and along the Sagunto road, making the withdrawal of the Italian troops too risky for the Fascists.

Chamberlain did everything to help carry out the agreement. Immediately after the adjournment of the French parliament, he prevailed upon the Daladier cabinet to seal the Franco-Spanish frontier on June 13. With the Portuguese frontier virtually open, this step brought about conditions much worse for the Loyalists than the previous full international control.

The Government armies were cut off from the rest of the world, while Franco's needs were met by supplies from the Spanish and Moroccan ports and Portugal. Still the Italian troops, the backbone of the Franco army, could not be withdrawn without endangering the entire position of the Fascist forces. Chamberlain, therefore, could not proceed to the application of the agreement which Mussolini, in view of the economic emergency in Italy, vociferously demanded.

In France the position and perspective of the Daladier cabinet became difficult. The Communists' demand for an immediate convocation of parliament, together with the determination of the Left forces to vote against the government, called for caution on the part of the British. Furthermore, the French government had to face a public alarmed by foreign developments. It appeared that a new German attack against Czechoslovakia was imminent. The feverish military activity along the Czechoslovakian frontier and the language of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shadowed decisive events at the next "favorable occasion" when the Reich—in the words of the famous editorial of the Essener Nazionalzeitung—will raise the question "as to whether Czechoslovakia, this airplane carrier of the Soviets, can be tolerated for any length of time in the heart of Europe."

To alleviate the serious emergencies confronting the cabinets in London and Paris, a strong demonstration of Franco-British solidarity, the royal visit to Paris, was decided upon. This maneuver means the continuation of the original policy with slight modifications but not the much-heralded integral change in the conceptions of Mr. Chamberlain. It means that the Italian agreement will not be applied immediately, unless Mussolini recalls his soldiers from Spain and guarantees French relations with Northern Africa in an additional Italo-French agreement. And it means coöperation between England and France in any Czechoslovakian crisis. It implies that the policy of the allies remains oriented towards a Loyalist defeat and the French frontier along the Pyrenees remains closed. And finally, it means that, in spite of demonstrations to make French relations secure, the *arrière pensée* of British policy is an agreement with Hitler and a four-power pact.

The masses of the French people consider the royal visit, as does the rest of the democratic world, a forceful expression of solidarity between two nations traditionally dedicated to freedom and peace. For this reason the visit transcends in importance the objectives defined in cabinet meetings. This does not mean that the alert and politically active French masses can be chloroformed into the acceptance of the "permanent objectives" of the Tory policy. The "average Frenchman" today is far from being just a happy onlooker of artistic official parades. He is deeply upset by the permanent war provocation of the fascist powers and disillusioned by the obvious results of the "non-intervention policy." And furthermore, he strongly resents the attack of the financial oligarchy on his wage level and forty-hour week. Three consecutive Finance Ministers started "reorganization" by lowering the franc, and the adjustment of wages is way behind that of prices.

In a much discussed article in Foreign Affairs, Charles Rist, director of the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, demands a decisive turn in the policy of the Daladier cabinet. This article, which is far from being the study of a disinterested economist, openly threatens another "inevitable" devaluation of the franc. Devaluation has been a useful weapon of reaction. By means of it, the first Left cabinet of France, under Herriot in 1924, was guillotined. Since that time M. Rist has presented several ultimata to popular-front cabinets and has always predicted with accuracy new drops of the franc. His resignation as director of the "equalization fund" set aside for the defense of the valuation in June, 1937. And now, in the above mentioned article, M. Rist has served another "ultimatum" on the government from the London-Paris oligarchy and, in addition, has attempted to create a panic of the franc in Wall Street.

M. Rist "advises" French statesmen to have the courage to impose heavy sacrifices upon the people. In addition to the abolition of the social-service legislation, he demands the suspension of the interest payment for a certain section of the public debt (*rente*) and heavy taxation of income derived from certain other sections. Since the *rente* is the traditional basis of the social security of the French middle classes, this would mean the expropriation of millions.

The pressure upon the government is invisible (apart from such "reorganization programs"), but immense. A tangible evidence of it is the emergency decrees of the Daladier government which are definite moves towards reorganization at the expense of labor and the middle strata. The Premier is, of course, getting serious warnings. Especially interesting are those coming from his own party. Leon Archimbaud, a Radical-Socialist deputy, recently called the attention of M. Daladier (whom he enthusiastically supports) to the fact that

> . . . Today, as in 1936, it is necessary to save freedom. It would be dead should the day come when the middle classes part from the proletariat . . . when it would appear that the Left parties were unable to save the living standards of the nation. . . .

Today the popular front is decisively strengthening its popularity. This may sound surprising in face of the widespread campaign in the financial press concerning the alleged unwillingness of Radical-Socialists to continue their alliance with the labor camp. Nevertheless, the facts contradict this campaign. In all recent by-elections—municipal, cantonal or parliamentary—popular-front candidates were victorious.

Tens of thousands of civil-service employees—a highly organized and active group—expected M. Daladier to adjust salaries to the price level. Farmers looked forward to an agricultural-insurance bill to protect them from natural calamities. An old-age-insurance bill was expected as part of the government's social-welfare legislation. The workers wanted wage increases and higher unemployment relief.

In face of all demands the government abruptly adjourned the parliament and engaged upon an unpopular course of internal and external policies. Naturally, the demand for the new convocation of the parliament is strong. The government would not be able to get majority support for its foreign and domestic, economic and financial policies.

What the campaigns against the popular front seem to overlook is that its real strength lies with the masses

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members voted in the Chamber against progressive reforms and legislation, just as New Deal measures were defeated in the United States Congress by "rebel" Democrats, but the attitude of the electorate on the questions involved is entirely different.

In France this attitude favors the close coöperation of all anti-fascist and progressive forces. It found expression in the joint demonstration of Radical-Socialists, Communists and Socialists on July 14. The military review on that day differed strongly from the official and semi-official pageants of the past weeks. The self-confidence and strength of the Parisian population was evident in the triumphant reception of the young workers marching in infantry formation and manning the *cadres* of national defense.

A call for the national convention of the popular front is now being prepared. Still stronger will be the worldwide repercussions of the conference of the "Rassemblement Universel pour la Paix" which unites in its present session in the Theatre des Ambassadeurs representatives of trade-union, pacifist and progressive movements and leading legislators and writers from all countries.

The able stage directors of the London-Paris oligarchy would hide the blaze of Spanish cities behind magnificent Parisian festivals and "non-intervention" diplomacy. But the people of France are a riotous audience to that Spanish drama and M. Daladier will have to reckon with them sooner or later.

LOUIS GIBARTI

The Marx-Engels Partnership

IN THE MEANTIME, Marx had gotten married and had taken Jenny to Paris in October, 1843. He had been reading up with his usual thoroughness on French communism and studying the French Revolution, about which he was planning to write a book.

But early in 1844 an essay came under his eye which Engels had written from England for the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher, to which Karl Marx was also contributing. It was an original and brilliant discussion of the "political economy" of the British, which Engels on his side had been reading up. Engels held that the theories of Adam Smith and Ricardo, of MacCulloch and James Mill, were fundamentally hypocritical rationalizations of the greedy motives behind the system of private property which was destroying the British peoples: the Wealth of Nations made most people poor; Free Trade and Competition left the people still enslaved and consolidated the monopoly of the bourgeoisie on everything that was worth having—all the philosophies of trade themselves only sanctified the huckster's fraud; the discussions of abstract value were kept abstract on purpose to avoid taking cognizance of the actual conditions under which all commercial transactions took place: the exploitation and destruction of the working class, the alternation of prosperity with crisis. Marx at once began to correspond with Engels, and he set himself to master as much of the British economists as he could find translated into French.

Engels arrived back from Lancashire about the end of August and stopped in Paris on his way home to Barmen. He immediately looked up Marx, and they found that they had so much to say to one another that they spent ten days together. Their literary as well as their intellectual collaboration began from that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to supplement one another. Like the copper and zinc electrodes of the voltaic cell of which the mystery was being debated in that age—the conductor liquid would be Hegel diluted in the political atmosphere of the eve of 1848—the two young Germans between them were able to generate a current which was to give energy to new social motors. The setting up of this Marxist current is the central event of our chronicle and one of the great intellectual events of the century; and even this electrical image is inadequate to render the organic vitality with which the Marx-Engels system in its growth was able to absorb such a variety of elements—the philosophies of three great countries, the ideas of both the working class and the cultured, the fruits of many departments of thought. Marx and Engels performed the feat of all great thinkers in summing up immense accumulations of knowledge, in combining many streams of speculation and in endowing the new point of view with a more vivid and compelling life.

It would not be worth while here to attempt to trace in detail the influence of all the thinkers that Marx and Engels laid under contribution. In a sense, such attempts are futile. The spotlighting method which I have used in this series must not be allowed to mislead the reader into assuming that great ideas are the creations of a special race of great men. I have discussed some of the conspicuous figures who gave currency to socialist ideas; and Professor Sidney Hook in his admirable "From Hegel to Marx" has indicated with exactitude the relation of Marx to his background of German philosophy. But behind these conspicuous figures were certainly sources less well known or quite obscure: all the agitators, the politicians, the newspaper writers, the pamphlets, the conversations, the intimations, the implications of conduct deriving from inarticulate or half-unconscious thoughts, the im-

It is appropriate to point this out at this particular moment of our story, because it was precisely this conception of intellectual movements as representative of social situations which Marx and Engels were to do so much to implant; and it will be interesting to fill in a little more completely the background of early nineteenth-century thought out of which Marx and Engels grew as well as to understand the relation of Marx and Engels to one another.

The great thing which Marx and Engels and their contemporaries had gotten out of the philosophy of Hegel was the conception of historical change. Hegel had delivered his lectures on the "Philosophy of History" at Berlin University during the winter of 1822-23 (Michelet, it may be remembered, had first come in contact with Vico the next year); and, for all his abstract and mystical way of talking, he had shown a very firm grasp on the idea that the great revolutionary figures of history were not simply remarkable individuals, who moved mountains by their single wills, but the agents through which the forces of the societies behind them accomplished their unconscious purposes. Julius Caesar, says Hegel, for example, did of course fight and conquer his rivals, and destroy the constitution of Rome in order to win his own position of supremacy, but what gave him his importance for the world was the fact that he was performing the necessary feat—only possible through autocratic control—of unifying the Roman Empire.

But where Hegel had tended to assume that the development of history through revolution, the progressive realization of the "Idea," had culminated in the contemporary Prussian state, Marx and Engels, accepting the revolutionary progress but repudiating the divine Idea, looked for a consummation of change in the future, when the realization of the communist idea should have resulted from the next revolution.

They had by this time their own new notions about communism. They had taken stock of their predecessors and, with their own sharp and realistic minds, they had lopped off the sentimentality and fantasy which had surrounded the practical perceptions of the utopians. From Saint-Simon they accepted as valid his discovery that modern politics was simply the science of regulating production; from Fourier, his arraignment of the bourgeois, his consciousness of the ironic contrast between "the frenzy of speculation, the spirit of all-devouring commercialism," which were rampant under the reign of the bourgeoisie and "the brilliant promises of the Enlightenment" which had preceded them; from Owen, the realization that the factory system must be the root of the social revolution. But they saw that the mistake of the utopian socialists had been to imagine that socialism was to be imposed upon society from above by disinterested members of the upper classes. The educator, as Marx was to write in his "Theses on Feuerbach," must, after all, first have been educated: he is not really confronting disciples with a doctrine which has been supplied him by God; he is merely directing a movement of which he is himself a member and which energizes him and gives him his purpose. Marx and Engels combined the aims of the utopians with Hegel's process of organic development. By the mid-century they were thus able to see quite clearly, as even John Humphrey Noyes did not do, that it was impossible for small communist units by themselves to effect the salvation of society or even to survive in the teeth of the commercial system; that it was not merely unfortunate accidents and disagreeable personal relations which had rendered the American communist movement futile but its ignorance of the mechanics of the class struggle.

Of this class struggle Marx had learned first from his reading of the French historians after he had come to Paris. Augustin Thierry in his "History of the Conquest of England," published in 1825, had presented the Norman Conquest in terms of a class struggle between the conquerors and the Saxons. Guizot, in his "History of the English Revolution," had shown, from the bourgeois point of view, the struggle between the middle class and the monarchy.

But it remained to root the class struggle in economics. We have seen how Friedrich Engels had come to appreciate the importance of economics as the result of his experience in Manchester. Karl Marx owed more to his reading. The idea of the fundamental importance of economic interests was not new in the eighteen-forties. A French lawyer named Antoine Barnave, who had been president of the revolutionary Assembly of 1790, had asserted that the difference between classes was the result of economic inequalities, that the class which was in power at any epoch not only made laws for the whole of society in order to guarantee its own hold on its property but also "directed its habits and created its prejudices," that society was constantly changing under the pressure of economic necessities, and that the rising and triumphant bourgeoisie which had displaced the feudal nobility would in turn produce a new aristocracy. Barnave, who was a moderate in politics and compromised himself with the royal family, was guillotined in 1793. A collected edition of his writings was published in 1843: but Marx never seems to have mentioned him, and it is not known whether he had ever read him. In any case, the thought of the period was converging during the first years of the forties toward the Marxist point of view. Friedrich List, the patriotic German economist, had published in 1841 his work on "The National System of Political Economy," in which he had described the development of society in terms of its industrial phases; and in 1842 a French communist named Dézamy, a former associate of Cabet, published his "Code de la Communauté." Karl Marx had read Dézamy at Cologne.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This writer had criticized Cabet for believing that anything could be done for labor by invoking the aid of the bourgeoisie, and, accepting the brute fact of the class struggle, had projected a somewhat new kind of community, based on materialism, atheism and science. Though Dézamy had not as yet arrived at any ideas about proletarian tactics, he was sure that the proletariat, among whom he included the peasants, must unite and liberate itself. It may be mentioned that the importance of the bottom class had already been emphasized by Babeuf when he had declared in the course of his defense that "the mass of the expropriated, of the proletarians" was generally "agreed to be frightful," that it constituted now "the majority of a nation totally rotten."

In the December of 1843, Marx had written for the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher a "Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law," in which he had postulated the proletariat as the class which was to play the new Hegelian role in effecting the emancipation of Germany:

> A class in *radical chains*, one of the classes of bourgeois society which does not belong to bourgeois society, an order which brings the break-up of all orders, a sphere which has a universal character by virtue of its universal suffering and lays claim to no *particular right*, because no *particular wrong* but complete wrong is being perpetrated against it, which can no longer invoke a *historical* title but only a *human* title, which stands not in a one-sided antagonism to the consequences of the German state but in an absolute antagonism to its assumptions, a sphere, finally, which cannot emancipate itself without freeing itself from all the other spheres of society and thereby freeing all these other spheres themselves, which in a word, as it represents the *complete forfeiting* of humanity itself, can only redeem itself through the *redemption of the whole of humanity*. The *proletariat* represents the dissolution of society as a special order.

Yet even though Marx has gotten so far, the proletariat remains for him still something in the nature of a philosophical abstraction. The primary emotional motivation in the role which he assigns to the proletariat seems to have been borrowed from his own position as a Jew. "The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism"; "a sphere, finally, which cannot emancipate itself without emancipating all the other spheres of society"—these are the conclusions in almost identical words of two essays written one after the other and published, as it were, side by side. Marx, on the one hand, knew nothing of the industrial proletariat and, on the other hand, refused to take Judaism seriously or to participate in current discussions of the Jewish problem from the point of view of the special case of Jewish culture, holding that the special position of the Jew was vitally involved with his money-lending and banking and that it would be impossible for him to dissociate himself from these until the system of which they were part should be abolished. The result was that the animus and rebellion which were due to the social disabilities of the Jew as well as the moral insight and world vision which were derived from his religious tradition were transferred in all their formidable power to an imaginary proletariat.

Perhaps the most important service which Engels performed for Marx at this period was to fill in the blank face and figure of Marx's abstract proletarian and to place him in a real house and real factory. Engels had brought back from England the materials for a book on "The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844," and he now sat down at once to get it written. Here was the social background which would make Marx's vision authentic; and here were cycles of industrial prosperity which always collapsed into industrial depressions—due, as Engels could see, to the blind appetites of the competing manufacturers—and which could only result in a general crash: that millennial catastrophe which for Marx was ultimately to dethrone the gods and set the wise spirit of men in their place.

And for Engels, on his side, here in Marx was the backing of moral conviction and of intellectual strength which was to enable him to keep his compass straight in his relation to that contemporary society whose crimes he understood so well but out of which he himself had grown and to which he was still organically bound as Marx was not. Besides, Marx had more weight and more will. Engels wrote with lucidity and ease; he had sensibility and measure and humor. He is so much more like a French writer of the Enlightenment—something between a Condorcet and a Diderot—than a philosopher of the German school that one is inclined to accept the tradition that his family had French Protestant blood. This young man without academic training was an immensely accomplished fellow: he had already learned to write English so well—and with a genuinely English not a Germanizing style—that he could contribute to Robert Owen's paper; and his French was as good as his English. He had a facility in acquiring information and a journalist's sense of how things were going; his collaborator Marx used to say that Engels was always ahead of him. But Engels has not Marx's drive; it is what we miss in his writing. From the beginning Marx is able to find such a quarrel in matters like the wood-theft debates that he can shake us with indignation against all violators of human relations; while Engels, with his larger experience of the cruelties and degradations of industrial life, does not—even in "The Condition of the Working Class"—rouse us to protest or to fight but tends rather to resolve the conflict in an optimistic feeling about the outcome. "Marx was a genius," wrote Engels later. "The rest of us were talented at best."

It is perhaps not indulging too far the current tendency toward this kind of speculation to suggest that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marx took over for Engels something of the prestige of paternal authority which the younger man had rejected in his own father. There was always something boyish about Engels: he writes Marx in the September of 1847, when he is twenty-seven, that he does not want to accept the vice-presidency of one of their communist committees, because he looks "so frightfully youthful." Young Friedrich had been rebelling since his teens against old Caspar Engels' combination of the serious crassness of business with the intolerance of religion; but old Engels' decisions for his son had hitherto determined his practical career. And, in spite of Friedrich's final enfranchisement from theology, some of the fervor of his father's faith had nevertheless been communicated to him. He had grown up in Barmen-Elberfeld under the pulpit of the great Calvinist preacher, Friedrich Wilhelm Krummacher, who with an eloquence which Engels had found impressive had used to alternate the legends of the Bible and a majestic oratory drawn from its language with illustrations from ordinary life and who had harrowed and subdued his congregations with the terrible Calvinist logic, which led them either to damnation or grace. Karl Marx was a great preacher too, and what was more, he was a profoundly religious man in everything except traditional theology. He seems to have provided the young apostate from Pietism with a new spiritual center of gravity.

When Engels went back to Barmen, at any rate, to live with his family and work in the family business, he continued to correspond with Marx; and he grew more and more dissatisfied and uncomfortable in an impatience which this correspondence must have fed.

He had evidently contracted some sort of engagement with a young lady of his own class and locality before he had left Barmen for Manchester; and now this seems to involve in his mind—his letters to Marx leave it all rather dark—the obligation to go to work for the firm. "I have let myself in through the persuasions of my brother-in-law and the melancholy faces of my parents for at least an attempt at this dirty trade and for fourteen days now I've been working in the office—the outlook in connection with my love affair has also brought me to it; but I was depressed before I started in: money-grubbing is too frightful; Barmen is too frightful, the waste of time is too frightful, and above all it is too frightful to continue to be, not merely a bourgeois, but actually a manufacturer, a bourgeois working against the proletariat. A few days in my old man's factory have compelled me to recognize the horror of it, which I'd rather overlooked before. . . . If it weren't for the fact that I am occupied every day in getting down on paper in my book the most dreadful accounts of English conditions, I believe I should have gone to seed already, but that has at least kept the rage in my bones. One can very well be a communist and yet keep up a bourgeois position, if only one *doesn't write;* but to work at serious communist propaganda and at industry and trade at the same time—that's really absolutely impossible."

He was holding working-class meetings with Moses Hess, who had become his ally in the Wuppertal; and they were getting out a communist paper in Elberfeld. As the weeks go on, his letters to Marx become irradiated by his characteristic hopefulness. One found communists everywhere now, he wrote.

But now old Engels became indignant, tragic. He could not stand Friedrich's associating with Hess, he could not stand his preaching communism in Barmen. "If it were not for the sake of my mother, who has a sweet and human nature and is only powerless against my father, and whom I really love, it would never occur to me for a moment to make even the pettiest concession to my fanatical and despotic old man. But my mother is gradually grieving herself sick and gets a headache that lasts for eight days every time she is specially worried about me—so I can't endure it any longer, I must get away, and I hardly know how I'm going to be able to get through the few weeks that I'll still have to stay."

Finally, he learned that the police were out to get him, and he left Barmen in the spring of '45. There is a passage in one of his letters from which it is possible to form the conjecture that he had been rather hoping to get into trouble in order to be forced to part with, as well as perhaps to be compromised in the eyes of, the young lady to whom he was somehow committed.

He joined Karl Marx in Brussels. The latter had himself had to leave Paris as a result of expulsion from France at the insistence of the German government, which was worried by the activities in Paris of revolutionary German refugees, and on an order from that Guizot, now Prime Minister, who had helped teach Marx the mechanics of the class struggle.

Then Engels went straight back to Manchester to find his friend Mary Burns again and to bring her over to France. He took Karl Marx along on the trip—exhibited to him the activities of Manchester and introduced him to the political economists in English. He reminded him a quarter of a century later of how they had used to look out through the colored panes of the bay-window of the Manchester library on weather that was always fine. It had been the light of that human intellect which they felt was now coming to maturity and which would vindicate the dignity of man, in the midst of that inhuman horror of filthiness and deformity and disease which hemmed the city in.

EDMUND WILSON

This is the fourth of a series of articles by Edmund Wilson dealing with the early days of Marx and Engels. The fifth article will be published in an early issue.

— THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Population Problems

SOME VERY INTERESTING THINGS are happening to the population of the United States. If recent trends are a safe guide to the future, the American people will not only cease to reproduce themselves effectively but, in the quarter-century following 1955, will actually decline in numbers by 10,000,000. This minimum estimate, which assumes a probable loss in the fertility of native white women of one-third from the 1930-34 level, and discounts the effects of immigration, will give us an indigenous population of barely 130,000,000 by 1980. In other words, during the next half-century the *natural* growth of our population will be virtually nil.

Even if we take the more encouraging maximum estimate, based on medium fertility rates and including an annual immigration of 100,000, we cannot count on a 1980 total of much more than 158,000,000 inhabitants. And in any case we must expect a disproportionate increase in the numbers of people of sixty-five and over: from 7,500,000 to 22,000,000. This fact alone constitutes an economic and social burden of no mean proportions; and when we add to it the glaringly inadequate distribution of medical, educational and economic opportunities for the rest of our present population, we have something to worry about.

In a widely discussed, 300-page report on "The Problems of a Changing Population," the National Resources Committee has made a significant contribution to our understanding of basic national issues.

The population problem of the United States is obviously not one of excess numbers. Indeed, the Committee definitely goes on record as favoring the present trend toward stabilization, in the belief—which seems to me a very mistaken one—that this is the only way to ensure "a favorable ratio of population to natural resources in the United States." For a country which already accomplishes half of the world's productive work to find difficulties in supporting more than about fifty persons per square mile is, to say the least, a damaging admission of national incompetence.

The crux of the problem is to be found in the Committee's detailed analysis of the qualitative factors affecting our population. Most important of these is the declining fertility of the country as a whole, especially in the great cities and among the more favored economic groups. The Committee presents a bewildering mass of statistics to show (1) that the highest birth rates occur in areas having the lowest material level of living, particularly in the Appalachian region; (2) that urban districts and industrially advanced parts of the country suffer from a chronic "birth deficit" which is made good only by internal migration from the more reproductive rural and agricultural districts; and (3) that there is no change in the long established tendency of those enjoying a higher standard of living to have the smallest number of children.

These extraordinarily complex differentials in the birth rate (which, curiously enough, is highest among American Indians), in addition to the major consequence of a stationary population, are slowly but surely maturing in a whole flock of economic and social problems. A declining fertility means that by 1975 there will be a 69-percent increase in the numbers of those over forty-five years of age, as compared with only 6 percent in the group from twenty to forty-four years. This at once suggests that the question of what is to be done with our middle-aged and old people is going to become a first-class national headache. An increase in the average age of the population means that the older workers—those who are now most likely to lose their jobs—must either be restored to some kind of productive labor, or constitute a terrific, and quite unnecessary, economic drain on the country at large.

On the subject of the health and vitality of the American people the report has two impressively documented chapters, followed by two others dealing with educational and cultural matters. From the medical viewpoint the picture is one of enormous technical facilities contrasted with appalling inequalities, both regional and occupational: a fact already made abundantly clear by the findings of the National Health Survey. Most of the major diseases are well under control, and American preventive medicine is fully equipped to handle many of the others. Nevertheless, owing entirely to economic differentials, there are in the United States 400,000 unnecessary deaths every year, and an estimated waste in productive capacity due to illness—much of which could be prevented—results in an annual loss to the country of four billion dollars: a sum approximately equal to the ordinary expenses of the federal government in 1929.

The most baffling problem is that of mental disease. There are in the United States today not far from two million mentally disabled people, of whom only about one-fourth receive hospital care. Despite this small proportion, it is enough to account for six out of every ten occupied hospital beds, and there are no indications of improvement. That this condition may be due to any significant degree to so-called "hereditary" causes—except within a very restricted group of cases—is categorically denied by the Committee in an instructive section on the genetic and eugenic aspects of population growth. That leaves, as the only convincing explanation, a large degree of social and economic maladjustment.

The net impression gained from a study of this valuable report is that if we can learn to provide adequately for our present 130,000,000 people, we will not need to worry about the bogey of excess numbers in the future.

HAROLD WARD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shoot the Works

Only a Boy

I WAS SORE AS A BOIL when I read a column by Westbrook Pegler about The Connecticut Nutmeg in which he said, "All that remains to be told is the news that Mr. Broun, the employer, is operating a rat, scab and fink shop in the terms of Mr. Broun, the president of the CIO union."

Next day at lunch I saw Quentin Reynolds and in a heated moment I said, "I think I'll sue the so-and-so."

Reynolds looked shocked. "Why you know good old Peg is just a great big boy," he said. "He was only kidding. Besides you can't sue. You're a newspaperman."

The last part of his statement was correct. Those who live by the sword must perish by the sword. But I am heartily sick of having friends of Peg justify his defense of the San Jose lynching and other outrageous attitudes like the Mooney piece by explaining that he was just trying to be cute. Peg and I were war correspondents together at Neufchateau in 1917 and by now he must be all of forty. At that age there are more charming assets in a journalist than retarded adolescence.

Under my own "terms" there is not a word of truth in Pegler's statement. The other owners of Nutmeg may not agree with me in all my labor views but there was unanimous assent that we must be printed in a union shop. Harold Yudain, who was hired as assistant to the editors a couple of weeks ago, was not a member of the Newspaper Guild at the time he was engaged. He had been working in the field of weekly Connecticut journalism where Guild organization has not been pushed. Hiring does not lie in my hands, but I would have had no right to say to my Nutmeg associates, "You must hire a Guild member."

Pegler, although himself a member of the Guild, has not familiarized himself with its policies or practices by attending meetings. Our union has pressed not for the "closed shop" but for the "Guild shop," which means that an editor may employ whomsoever he pleases, regardless of union affiliation, but that the newcomer must join the Guild after a set period of months. So far the Guild has not attempted to sign up papers with no more than a two-man staff. I was not in a position to tell Yudain that he must join the Guild but I said that I hoped he would. He did.

The only other man on the Nutmeg staff who is not an owner-editor is my son, Heywood Hale Broun, who is acting as assistant to Yudain. Technically, maybe, objection might be raised that he is not actually on Nutmeg payroll. I have to pay him an allowance anyway and I increased that largess to a sum above the Guild requirement for a beginner so as not to undercut the market. As a matter of fact there wasn't any market. Nutmeg's editors voted that at the present time we could not afford more than one salaried employee and that the wage should be up to Guild standard for an experienced man. It is higher.

Two years ago he worked a few weeks for Monte Bourjaily on Midweek Pictorial. He joined the Guild at that time and is still a member. Last Summer I managed to didn't take it. I don't know whether that was indolence or a fear that his reply might be used against him when he tried to get a job on The New York Herald Tribune, after graduation, and was asked, "Where did you work last?" That's his business.

But most of the long winded details which I am supplying are not just my business. I have been five times elected president of the American Newspaper Guild and if Peg's accusations were accurate I would be a little lower than Iscariot. If anybody says, "Where's your sense of humor?" I believe I have the right to answer, "I'll park that at a time when I am inferentially accused of being a hypocrite and a faker."

I was one of the founders of the American Newspaper Guild and it is the only important work I ever did in my life. I am proud of the fact that I have been five times unanimously elected as president. That doesn't mean that I have made great sacrifices for the Guild. I haven't. In the last couple of years I have loafed shamefully. But once upon a time I worked hard on Guild business. Self-interest actuated me. The Guild has given me more than I ever could give the Guild. When the Guild came along I was just a fat slob. Now I'm not all slob.

I came into the newspaper business with a brass check in my hand. I worked on a Broadway paper where the managing editor used to say, "Broun, Mr. Eddie X has just given us a big ad for Sunday. See that he gets a swell notice when you write your vaudeville review." The Guild is making it possible for all of us to lift up our hands and show that we are no longer palming the base metal of prostitution.

Peg is a member of the Guild. But he doesn't like the Guild at the present time and he has done a lot of beefing from without. I believe that like Reuben Maury, chief editorial writer for The New York Daily News, he is 100 percent for the rank and file and against the leadership. I wonder why he doesn't try to change it.

Peg has said repeatedly that the Guild officers are high-pressured slickers who don't give himself and other working newspapermen a chance to be heard. But at the last local election in New York he was elected as an alternate to the Guild assembly and although months have gone by he has never attended a single meeting. This I think compromises his right to criticize.

In somewhat calmer manner I can deny Peg's statement that I am planning to capture Congressman Phillips' seat in Congress. I have no great respect for either the seat or the soul of Mr. Phillips and I would just love to go to Congress. But I know I haven't a chance on earth to get elected from around here. I couldn't even carry the Nutmeg office. I am not only the president of a CIO union but for several years a member of the executive committee of the CIO. I am an ardent New Dealer but with the reservation that in my opinion Mr. Roosevelt and his policies are by far too conservative. I could be wrong but anybody who thinks I'm kidding is cockeyed.

And so, although I'm not going to sue anybody, I'm still good and sore. Nor am I alone in finding it harder to receive than to give. One night at Peg's a mutual newspaper friend was present. Maybe he was a little tight. During the middle of general buffet-supper conversation he pointed across the lawn to the Swiss chalet and said in a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And in the somewhat startled lull that followed he added, "You dish out too damn much vinegar in your salad dressing, Peg. Correct that before I come again."

He didn't come again. It was the end of a beautiful friendship. So is this. HEYWOOD BROUN

Washington Notes

Papa's Home Again

MR. ROOSEVELT'S RETURN this week will be greeted by rank-and-file New Dealers here with whoops of joy. Despite the New Deal's substantial primary successes, these followers of the President are worried. What is at stake in the present campaign, they feel, is not merely a handful of senatorships and seats in the House, but control of the 1940 Democratic convention. They are worrying about the states with big convention delegations.

These rank-and-file New Dealers want to know whether the 1940 convention delegates are to be picked in New York by the machine nominally headed by Governor Lehman; in Pennsylvania by the machine owned by State Chairman Lawrence and Boss Contractor McCloskey; in Ohio by the machine built up by Governor Davey; in Indiana by the McNutt-Townsend machine; in Illinois by the Horner machine. New Dealers suspect all these groups.

Probably nothing can be done to remedy affairs in Illinois and Indiana. A great deal can be done in Pennsylvania. The Administration can use its influence to patch up the quarrel between the conservative Lawrence-McCloskey faction and the New Dealers, headed by Senator Guffey and Mr. John L. Lewis. The administration can insist that Pennsylvania's workers be given their due voice in the councils of the party. This must be done not only to ensure a New Deal convention delegation in 1940, but to keep Pennsylvania from going Republican next November.

These Notes are written before the results of the Ohio primary are known. But whether or not Mr. Davey has been renominated, it seems clear the state Democratic machine will not of itself abandon its connections with big business, or Davey's Tammany methods. The administration needs to intervene.

New York is perhaps the most difficult problem. Of the candidates for Governor, Attorney-General Bennett now appears to be leading. Despite his recent soothing words for labor, it is not unfair to class him as anti-New Deal. If the situation were not so serious, it would be ludicrous. It is entirely conceivable that Mr. Roosevelt, the most popular President in many years, may be tacitly repudiated by his own state. The administration seems to have made no progress towards persuading Senator Wagner to take the nomination for Governor. Underground movements have been begun in behalf of WPA Administrator Hopkins, Representative Mead and Solicitor-General Jackson. Apparently the White House strategists have not even agreed on a single New Deal candidate.

These five states—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois—form the industrial liver, lungs and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delegates to the Democratic national convention. They can outvote the South, the West or New England. No observer here thinks that their delegates in the 1940 Democratic convention would vote against a third nomination for Mr. Roosevelt, if he should desire it. To do that would mean civil war within the party, and would give the ensuing presidential election to the Republicans as a free-will offering. But unless Mr. Roosevelt, restored by his fishing trip, acts decisively in the next few weeks, it is not impossible that in 1940 the Democratic machines of these five big states may prevent him from naming his successor.

Possibly you have wondered what has become of the Great Purge, announced last May. The Purge was not a matter of taking simple precautions in a few important states. Its purpose was to change history. By driving all Right-of-Center members from the Democratic party, it was to transform it into the first genuinely liberal political instrument we have had since the days of Andrew Jackson.

Apparently there isn't going to be a purge. Mr. Tydings of Maryland, beside whom Mr. Herbert Hoover is warm, human and philanthropic, is being attacked with vigor, and Mr. Roosevelt is scheduled to speak this month for his opponent, Representative Lewis. But of the last eight Democratic Senators on the purge list, four have been renominated; Lonergan of Connecticut has been frigidly forgiven by Attorney-General Cummings, and McCarran of Nevada will be left in peace. In the next few days we shall learn how far Mr. Roosevelt means to go in opposing Messrs. George of Georgia and Smith of North Carolina.

To this observer, at least, Labor's Non-Partisan League has taken a sounder position. About a month ago, the LNPL made public two lists, one containing the names of the Congressmen whom it considered to be labor's friends, another of labor's enemies. The lists were in black ink on white paper. Newspaper correspondents were not compelled to watch Mr. John L. Lewis—as they were Mr. Roosevelt on his trip to the Pacific coast—to discover whether he called this-or-that Congressman by his title, his surname or a nickname in order to learn whether he was in or out of the LNPL's good graces.

The LNPL's action has its penalties. When Senator Adams received the Colorado Democratic convention's designation, equivalent to renomination, it was hard to say whether Mr. Roosevelt had been defeated or not, since he had made no open announcement of his position. But when Representative Dies was renominated in Texas, conservative newspapers gleefully told of the CIO's defeat, because Mr. Dies was on the LNPL's list of labor's enemies.

The LNPL's list, however, has been used against it unfairly. Correspondents have written as though the names on the LNPL's list were those of Congressmen whom the LNPL intended to defeat. Whenever one of them wins a primary fight, his victory is cited as an example of the LNPL's weakness. But the LNPL made no such pretensions

During the last days of the session, the LNPL compiled an exhaustive record of every member of the House. The information concerning each man was sent to labor groups in his district. Many groups wrote back to Washington complaining that the records were too perfect and

experimentation, the LNPL's director, Mr. E. L. Oliver, developed a cold-blooded, scientific scale for measuring each Congressman's usefulness to the labor movement. Four categories were established, ranging from "A" to "D." The "D" is the LNPL's so-called purge list. A conscientious reporter would have seen immediately that this could not possibly have been true, since it carried the names of men like Mr. Pettingill of Indiana, who is not standing for reëlection, and J Bayard Clark of North Carolina, who had been renominated before the list was even thought of. Nevertheless, the LNPL is standing firm. It takes the attitude that because a Congressman may be difficult to defeat, he is not any the less an enemy of the labor movement.

In last week's Notes, an attempt was made to show the dangers in the American Labor Party's coalition with the Republicans of New York City. Since then, the ALP has abandoned its offer to exchange support for candidates for Congress. However, since the coalition on candidates for the state legislature remains intact, the possible advantages and perils are unchanged.

Washington T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Wall Street Myths

ONE OF THE DIFFICULTIES in the way of dealing with important public problems is the persistence of assumptions—very often hoary assumptions which everybody accepts and nobody ever tries to prove. Everywhere you go in the twisting highways of finance you find these assumptions and certain groups of well-provisioned gentlemen squatting on them and collecting the while.

One of the phenomena in Wall Street which filled me with wonder when I began to look into that deep and ill-lighted alley was the great number of widely accepted "truths"—"self-evident propositions"—current there for which I could find not a shred of proof or attempted proof, or supporting data anywhere. Take, for instance, the theory that "liquidity" is essential to the stable functioning of the economic system or that speculation in securities is essential to the financing of new industries. For many years I had heard these and many more wise pronouncements which all "informed" men knew were true and of course I never questioned them. But when I got around many years ago to actually questioning them and asking for the proofs I was utterly dumbfounded to discover that no one had ever taken the trouble to set down a single sentence or a fragment of data in proof of either of these assertions.

One of the assumptions which most people accept and which I have always accepted was that "conservation" of our great natural oil resources was one of the most imperious of all our resource problems. We have been told that our petroleum resources will give out in a dozen years, in twenty years, in thirty years—the time varying with the eloquence of the speaker—but certainly that one day we would find ourselves without oil, whereupon our great gasoline empire would collapse.

Now comes Mr. William J. Kemnitzer with a great flail and proceeds to whip down this assumption. Mr. Kemnitzer is a geologist. And it is quite evident that he knows plenty about oil. He is an independent consulting petroleum technologist and has been frequently called into important litigation as an expert on oil problems. But, unlike most geologists and engineers, he has concerned himself deeply about the economic problems which surround this great petroleum industry. And he has written a book ("The Rebirth of Monopoly," Harper's, 1938), of rare authority and interest, on the presence of monopoly in the oil fields. There it reared its ugly head away back in 1872 and as fast as the head was cut off it grew more heads and more tentacles until today, according to Mr. Kemnitzer, it is more potent and more menacing than it has ever been. Every member of the commission just convoked to investigate monopoly should be compelled to read this book at least once. I suggest to Senator O'Mahoney, chairman, that he put a copy into the hands of all his colleagues.

The War, which like all wars introduced so many social and economic diseases, gave an immense impetus to the advance of monopoly. When the War came a number of business men and their apologists were busy trying to develop the system of what they called open competition, which included the development of the trade association, agreements on prices, production and trade practices under the guise of fair trade. The War made a fertile field for the growth of this idea. For during the War the nation itself became a giant monopoly—a whole population united in one objective. The government called producers together and showed them how to combine, how to control their functions to produce more to win the War. When the War was over the patriots who had come together to produce more to save the nation continued to remain united to produce less and skin the nation.

Resistance to combined action had been weakened. And for seven years, until Hoover became President, there was an orgy of codes of practices or codes of ethics. The oil companies at this time began to raise the bogey of oil exhaustion as the basis for united action by oil producers to control production in the interest of scarcity and higher prices. So well did they cry "wolf" that the government itself literally took over the whole publicity and propaganda activities of the oil companies. Federal officials and state governments became the patrons of the combination movement in the cause of conservation. When the New Deal came in, it supported combination in the oil fields upon an even grander scale and invested with the force of law the codes for scarcity which had been drawn by the oil men—until Harold Ickes, who is one of the wisest of the New Dealers, began to have his doubts about all this.

Surely we are the victims of words. Old evils, bad ideas, dangerous practices wrapped up in nice words. You can kill a good dog by giving him a bad name. But you can also give a poor pooch a good name and get him into society. "Proration," "stabilization," "conservation," "fair trade"—all these, Mr. Kemnitzer insists, are just respectable words to cover the meaning of monopoly. And he makes a pretty good case for that thesis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Red and Mildred (Cont'd)

WHEN I left off talking about Red Norvo a few weeks back he was hanging in the air over Fifty-second Street, where swing was beginning its revival in earnest. That of course was after Beardsley, Ohio (b. 1908, on the river), and after amateur and vaudeville work on xylophone, regular work with bands (Ash, Bernie, Whiteman), and after he had decided to go on his own.

There was more to his decision to do it the hard way than the usual desire to call the tune or read his name in lights: he had a special conception of music, balance, restraint, clean ensembles and no tricks (the "Ida" number he brought from vaudeville and still uses, with special sock mallets and all, is a "novelty," but at the same time one of my favorites in musical invention and lilt). And under a complete delicacy of taste he had the urgent carrying beat without which music like this must be sick or pseudo. Add to this equipment a set of qualities rare in band leaders—for he was sunny, patient and almost shy; yet confident enough and flexible enough of mind so that he would rather hire an unknown kid with talent than the Best Man in the Field, even on the same terms, and when he got the men he would hold his own way with deference, leading and bringing out rather than shoving around—add this and you may see why the Red Norvo style is always evident no matter who plays with him, men more famous or men not famous at all. All his music is its own signature, cleanly built, free within its own compass in the way the boys call relaxed, and with the thrusting power so well absorbed in it that sometimes you have to get your feet moving on the dance floor before you notice how it really jumps.

Red was playing in Dempsey's supper room when he had his last small group; but even in these six pieces—Red himself, two reeds, one horn, guitar and bass—there was a rounded organization that I have never heard bettered in that compass (some coming young fellers too: Haymer, Pletcher, Barbour, Peterson). Since then he has been playing the regular dance-band grind, which requires around twelve pieces, two vocalists and all that. And there have been changes. But there is always the unassuming slight figure behind his atrocious pile of wood, his head back to coax the rhythm up a little (and Mildred fidgets over her Scotch at the table: "Damn if that old man I got ever *can* kick it off fast enough. You know how it is, you work up a program and break your neck and then you find out it drags all to hell—come *on,* Kenneth, before I . . .") or hanging over the plates with his ear cocked for a special four-note harmony, or for the clear line of notes in solo, quiet, at ease in his work, taking pleasure from it as the mood of song changes from drive to old melody.

And the records already printed will give you some of it, not all. First there were some scattered items and a few sides of his own composition. Then Columbia made several sides ("I Surrender, Dear," "Blues in E-Flat," "The Night Is Blue") with some good men under Red. I recommend for your pleasure and for posterity the "Blues" one, as being perfect in the collective feeling and very high and strange in the interludes of Norvo and Wilson, whose instruments come up through the pattern with the renew-

When he had the small band playing nightly, the recordings (Decca mostly, a few on Bluebird) were not his best. But you can take "Lady Be Good," "Decca Stomp" and "Polly Wolly Doodle" as partial representatives of a period whose truest expression was dedicated to the smoky air of this or that hole-in-the-wall and to memory.

In this small-band period, Red had discovered a young genius over in Jersey somewhere who could take any group of notes and arrange them for a band of any size, Eddie Sauter. Eddie Sauter is still doing the Norvo arrangements, and it is as much to him as to Red's orchestra that you can credit the distinction of the Brunswick-Vocalion (Norvo-Bailey) releases of the past two years or so—a distinction that remains in spite of the traditional mishandling of tunes and band types that is peculiar to the recording industry (that is, a song that Red could do beautifully is assigned to some organization which will do it anything but; also vice versa). I won't bother you with a list of such instances, and I won't try to make a complete list of the good stuff. But first of all get the Brunswick Norvo of "Remember" and listen to the way the old sweetness of that song is both cherished and kept from resolving into sugar. Get the more folkish tune, so right because so fantastic, "A Porter's Love Song to a Chambermaid." Get the more recent "Tea-Time" (P.S.: in the jargon, tea is not something you drink) or "Please Be Kind," on which Mildred, backed by the orchestra, makes the perishable turn of today's song a thing for many tomorrows. It is too bad that at recording time Mildred hadn't quite got under control one of the best of this year, the Duke Ellington tune about "I Let a Song Go Out of My Hear," but the record is good.

I hinted before that Mildred Bailey was a hard girl to follow; but there is this about her exactions: she knows when an accompanist is getting out of control and raises hell accordingly. A couple of years ago when she was appearing on the series John Hammond was making for release through English Parlophone, Mildred seemed a little petulant about the small orchestra that backed her. Everything sounded so good in the studio that there seemed to be no reason for exceptions: yet when the records came out finally (those wonderful tunes of recollection: "Willow Tree," "Down Hearted Blues," "Squeeze Me," etc.) it was clear at once: the instrumentalists were all swell, but they never quite wove that essential net of background.

Of the first general group recorded under her own name, the pick has been reissued on Bluebird: "Old Rockin' Chair" and "Georgia"; of the second, "Someday Sweetheart" and "When Day Is Done," backed by a small pick-up band. Don't forget the "Junk Man" she made with Goodman for Columbia and, out of the dozen songs she did (on Brunswick) with the Dorsey Brothers' and Casa Loma orchestras, "Lazybones" and "Blues in My Heart." But the best group generally has come in the last year or so, when she has been working steadily with Red and when both voice and background have seemed at their highest point in natural ease and balance. Even the more ephemeral pops are worth having: "It's the Natural Thing to Do," "If You Ever Should Leave," "Where Are You?" and "Little Joe" (with their reverse sides, all on Vocalion). And when she gets around to "Lover, Come Back to Me," Rube Bloom's "I Can't Face the Music," Carmichael's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thinking of that old Bessie Smith interjection: Don't say a *word* just listen.

Mildred has no vast range and without amplifiers you couldn't hear her past the tenth row; and her personal style might leave you cold at first, because it seems almost an immature voice, working against a tight constraint and phrasing the song not only for musical sense but for her own plunging rhythms. Play her on an old crank-winding mechanical machine and you will hear nothing but a child's voice without interest. But when some high-fidelity set approximates the intricate mystery of overtones, the comparison will show that expression here lies wholly in the field of color surrounding that white point we call perfect pitch. This musical idiom once accepted and understood, you will find a singing strength as wide as the difference between (think for a minute of the hollow-reed, overblowing, spaghetti-meat-balls tradition of opera singing) a pianola and a musician sitting with his lusty or tender hands on the keyboard.

Red Norvo (who must naturally have more music in his head than most of us will ever hear) heard all that at once, and has since arranged to bring it out even more clearly—until we have, as a going concern, a dance-radio-recording band that is among the best in its own right and is at the same time the flexible, stimulating medium for one of the best instruments of our whole native expression. Like all the great ones in their form, Red and Mildred are part composers of every song they do; and for that reason—music being only partly mechanics and mostly human spirit—I believe I'd rather hear Mildred grumbling and tuning up her pipes while that band is getting the last chorus set than the traditional ineffabilities of the traditional choir of angels.

OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

SECOND GLORIOUS WEEK. It has already proved GATE-CRASH picture in the city. VALOR at the heart! VICTORY over the heart. New Theatre's Social Arguments. No Less Renowned than Valor and Victory in War! "Abhagin." Recounting the Valor and Victories of the Frail Young Lass SANDHYA. – *From an advertisement in the Indian magazine, National Front.*

Claimant stated that he left his employment because he found the employer's abusive language unbearable. Testimony showed employer used abusive language to all his employees. . . . Board found that condition complained of appeared to have been purely subjective with the employee and concluded that the employee left his work voluntarily and was therefore ineligible for unemployment insurance. – *From a news item in the Prentice-Hall Unemployment Insurance Service.*

Don't-Cross-Your-Perils Department

The great danger to Christianity is communism. We sympathize with Japan because she is destroying communism, yet we hope someone else later will destroy Japan to check the yellow peril. – *Observations by a Spanish*

Wonders-of-Science Department

Is it because of poverty that you get sick? There is a direct relationship between poverty and living conditions. There is a probable relationship between living conditions and disease. Therefore there can only be an indirect relationship between poverty and disease. Poverty of itself does not cause disease. – *The Rev. Alfonse M. Schwitalla, dean of the St. Louis University Medical School and president of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada, speaking at the recent National Health Conference in Washington, D. C.*

Not Yours, Baby

Six men are being designated to each police officer, and their duty, at a given signal, is to wipe out 18,000 policemen in the City of New York. Our sense of humor is getting us into trouble. – *New York State Senator John J. McNaboe, quoted in The New York Herald Tribune in reference to an alleged radical plot.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

What Happened in Austria

SIR: Mr. Drucker's article on the "Social Revolution in Austria" [The New Republic, July 6], representing the cruel persecution of the Viennese Jews as one of "the most thorough-going social revolutions in modern history," is not in accordance with the actual facts.

1. It is not true that the Austrian bourgeoisie is concentrated in Vienna only, and "there is no bourgeois class elsewhere in Austria." According to the census of 1934, the percentage of owners is much larger in the provincial areas of Austria than in Vienna. There are only 154,631 gainfully occupied "independents" in Vienna, compared with 495,034 in the provinces. Even if we discard a half of the latter as representing comparatively poor peasants (there are also, by the way, many poor devils among the "independent" artisans and peddlers of Vienna), we still arrive at the conclusion that, contrary to Mr. Drucker's statement, the majority of the Austrian bourgeoisie lives outside of Vienna. Consequently, the elimination of the bourgeoisie in Vienna would not form a social revolution in Austria as a whole.

2. Jews, including "non-Aryans" in the Nazi sense of the word, are not the majority of Vienna's bourgeoisie. There are only 176,034 Jews (in the usual meaning of this word) among Vienna's 1,874,130 inhabitants. The number of "non-Aryans" who do not consider themselves as Jews can be easily estimated on the basis of the very accurate statistics on Jews who renounced their religion during the last two generations, and of mixed marriages in which they were involved. It can be easily proved beyond any doubt that the total number of Jews and "non-Aryans" in Vienna is below 300,000. Mr. Drucker's assertion that there are in Vienna 650,000 "Jews and non-Aryans belonging to the upper and middle classes" is therefore utterly fantastic, especially if we take into consideration his own admission that "about a half of Vienna's Jews are proletarians." Does Mr. Drucker want to tell us that 1,300,000 of Vienna's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. It is probably true that the percentage of bourgeois among Vienna's Jews is larger than among the Aryans. The difference, however, could not be so great as to assure an actual Jewish majority among Vienna's possessing classes.

Mr. Drucker himself admits that since the War "the Viennese Jews have lost a great part of their former economic and social positions." As one who lived in Vienna before 1914, I may testify that even then Jews did not dominate the economic life of the Austrian metropolis. Even then the majority of them belonged to the proletariat. There was a considerable number of Jews in Vienna's trade unions, and a census of the unemployed taken in 1910 showed that the percentage of Jews among them was about the same as their part in the general population.

True, Jews were quite conspicuous—from the superficial point of view. This is easily explained by the concentration of Jewish businesses in the central parts of the city. But are the landlords, the restaurant owners, the saloon keepers, the shop and factory owners in the other districts of Vienna, where most of the population is concentrated, bourgeois or proletarians? At least 90 percent of them were pure Aryans.

The important part traditionally taken by Jews in certain trades and professions—medicine, law, finance, the textile industry—should not mislead us into exaggerating their economic role in Vienna as a whole. Only the lowest type of Nazi propaganda could stoop to the assertion that "there is only one Aryan among Vienna's 108 bankers." Mr. Drucker should give the source of such amazing information. . . .

The inevitable conclusion of all these facts is that Jews are not the majority of Vienna's bourgeoisie, and their elimination did not radically change the social character of the city—still less of Austria as a whole.

4. Even if Jews were the majority of Vienna's bourgeoisie, their elimination would form a social revolution only in case their factories or business establishments were to become state enterprises. Nothing of this kind is happening. Unless Jewish businesses were liquidated altogether, they were given as a rule to new Aryan owners. The Nazi rulers of Austria are even advertising for Aryan businessmen to take over Jewish enterprises. After a smart Aryan acquires the Jewish business—for a small fraction of its real value—it is being run by the new owner on the usual capitalistic basis. Does the substitution of Heinz Meyer for Morris Cohn, as capitalist, constitute a social revolution?

5. Why does Mr. Drucker in his description of the "social revolution" in Austria scrupulously fail to mention the fate of the "other half" of Vienna's Jewry, which, according to his own testimony, belongs to the proletariat? Were these Jewish proletarians more kindly treated by the "anti-capitalistic" Nazis of Austria?

The wholesale dismissal of Jewish workers from their jobs, however useful or humble they were, is the convincing answer. Deprived of their livelihood and devoid of any resources, the Jewish proletarians of Vienna, who are as a matter of fact the majority of the "non-Aryan" population, are actually condemned to hunger and death. The picture of the "social Revolution" in Austria cannot be complete without this illuminating detail.

ABRAHAM REVUSKY,
Foreign News Editor, The Jewish Morning Journal
New York City

SIR: Mr. Revusky's letter seems to call for an answer on four counts:

1. Although Mr. Revusky does not say so specifically, it is obvious that he read my article as implying sympathy with and cruelty, the main argument of my article, namely that the German military machine is the real beneficiary of the expropriation of the Austrian upper and upper-middle classes, attests so sufficiently to my vigorous opposition to Nazism as to make any further assertion of my convictions superfluous.

2. Mr. Revusky challenges the statement that the expropriation of the Viennese bourgeoisie is equivalent to a social revolution throughout Austria. The figures which he uses as proof for his contention that the majority of the Austrian bourgeoisie lived outside Vienna are, however, meaningless. The census includes under the heading of "gainfully occupied independents" not only every farmer—freeholder and tenant—but every artisan and small shopkeeper as well, but it does not include thereunder the employed president of a bank, the university professor or a judge of the Supreme Court. Mr. Revusky's use of the word "bourgeois" might therefore pass in Marxist terminology but is contrary to the ordinary usage of the word. In order to make just such a misunderstanding as Mr. Revusky's impossible, I defined moreover my use of the word "bourgeois" several times by adding to it the words "upper and upper-middle classes."

3. Mr. Revusky challenges my figure of the number of Jews and non-Aryans living in Vienna. Of course, my article does not give any basis for his figure of 1,300,000 Jews and non-Aryans, but states clearly that Vienna contains about 90,000 Jewish proletarians and 550,000 to 650,000 Jewish or non-Aryan members of the bourgeoisie. As for the discrepancy between this figure and Mr. Revusky's 300,000, it is due to the fact that Mr. Revusky defines Jews as the Jewish community defines them and as they have always been defined by every one until Hitler came to power, namely as the people who either belong to the Jewish religious community or have themselves left this community. Mr. Revusky will find in my article that I entirely agree with his figure as far as these racially pure Jews are concerned, which is a matter of course since we both used the same source. It is, however, the very essence of the Nazi racial creed that it does not accept this definition but includes all descendants of mixed marriages under the heading "Jews" although they not only, as Mr. Revusky points out, did not consider themselves Jews but were not so considered by the Jewish community, which therefore has no figures on them. Moreover, Mr. Revusky forgets that the Germans also treat Aryan husbands or wives of non-Aryans as "Jews" unless they agree to a divorce. It will interest Mr. Revusky that I was given an even higher estimate of the total number of non-Aryans by one of the official leaders of the Vienna Jewish community, whose name I cannot publish for obvious reasons; I am perfectly willing to furnish the name privately to Mr. Revusky.

The statement that all bankers but one were non-Aryan (although a substantial number were not of pure Jewish blood but of mixed parentage) comes from the Vienna Association of Private Bankers, which has been publishing the numbers and names of private banking firms for which a commissar was appointed for "racial reasons."

4. Mr. Revusky reproaches me for failing to mention specifically the fate of the Viennese proletarian Jews. But my article contains the very statement regarding the wholesale dismissal of Jews and non-Aryans from their jobs, which he considers a convincing answer to his own query. To describe in detail how these dismissals took place and how they affected the Jewish population was not only superfluous in view of the extensive reports in the daily papers but also impossible within the space of a short magazine article. And this applies especially as, in consequence of the Nazi measures, all Austrian Jews and non-Aryans have become paupers whatever their former social

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Descendants Protest

SIR: On behalf of the Descendants of the American Revolution, a group dedicated to the furtherance of American liberty, I am writing to take issue with Mr. William J. Wallin's stand against the anti-racial-discrimination proposal now before the Constitutional Convention at Albany.

Mr. Wallin was reported in The New York Times (July 20) as opposing this amendment on the basis of the "God-given" right to exercise racial prejudice. We, as descendants of those who in 1776 fought for freedom against tyranny, view with suspicion and alarm men of succeeding generations who in the name of liberty seek to destroy those very principles for which our Revolutionary forefathers struggled. . . .

Instead of fulfilling our American tradition of asylum for the oppressed of the world, Mr. Wallin seeks to reëstablish here those very discriminations from which the founders of our country came here to escape. . . .

We, the Descendants of the American Revolution, believe that the enactment of the proposed anti-racial-discrimination amendment would mark a great step forward in the extension of those liberties which are the foundation of American democracy.

SYLVIA WILCOX RAZEY
Executive Secretary,
New York City Descendants of the American Revolution

Wilson on Marx

SIR: I yield to no one in admiration of the keen and subtle criticism of Edmund Wilson, particularly the essays on Proust and Joyce in "Axel's Castle." The parts on Yeats and Eliot are less successful, but critics in our times seem generally deaf to poetic values, and certainly Mr. Wilson is head and shoulders ahead of most of them. However, when he ventures into the field of social criticism and evaluation, as in his current series of articles on Marx and Engels, his cunning seems to leave him, and what is left is merely the undistinguished rehash of the obvious or well known, rendered into a prose, worthy, perhaps, of the run of contemporary journalism, but certainly far below standards set by Mr. Wilson himself in his earlier work. It is because we have learned to expect much of him, to depend upon the accuracy of his discerning and understanding judgment, that, when we find him at anything less than his very excellent best, we feel somehow cheated. . . .

Cambridge, Mass. HENRY D. AIKEN

Can War Be Civilized?

SIR: Can war be civilized? If a military man should answer this question in the negative, he would admit that his life work is unjustifiable; for an activity that cannot be civilized has no place in the international system that we seek to establish. It is not quite fair to ask him the question. His only recourse is "rationalization," unless indeed he is willing to confess himself a sinner. . . .

Major George F. Eliot in his article (The New Republic, July 20) places reliance on "rules of warfare." Now any student of history knows that if in the judgment of the supreme military command disaster can be averted only by breaking such a rule, it will forthwith be broken, with or without "truculent defiance." One must have a simple mind to suppose that any nation would through the observance of a restrictive rule bring about its own defeat. Such a rule will be observed only when it does not conflict with the superior law of "military necessity." Moreover, let it never be forgotten that any rule of warfare is a rule for the conduct of an activity that violates civilization. Will rules for murd[illegible]

Westchester Women—and Others

SIR: Anent Bruce Bliven and the crooked women of Westchester [The New Republic, July 27]: Before Mr. Bliven jumps to any conclusions, let him interview floor walkers, salesladies and managers of stores like Woolworth's or Klein's On-the-Square. He could also question the owners of corner groceries. I am sure that the condition he assumed true for only one class is true for all women generally. . . .

New York City J. PHIMISTER

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Solomon Diamond, secretary of The Psychologists' League, New York City, accuses Warner Brothers of abusing the educational power of the movies in "When Were You Born?" ". . . The various powers ascribed to astrologers in this picture have never been demonstrated to be humanly possible. . . . It is vicious, therefore, to spread via motion pictures the idea that astrology is dependable in forecasting events" . . . Dr. C. C. Probert of Flint, Michigan, sends an enthusiastic description of a meeting of the Flint Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy at which the Rev. Father Michael J. O'Flanagan spoke.

D. E. Layman of New York City calls to our attention "Business Editorial Service," published by an organization called Six Star Service, and distributed free to all who wish to use its material. It contains conservative musings about current affairs, signed for the most part by prominent faculty members of American colleges and universities. It is paid for by the National Association of Manufacturers. . . . Alfred H. Forman, County Supervisor of the WPA Adult Education and Recreation project, Meadville, Pennsylvania, points out the cleavage between "most institutional educators" and the leaders in the Federal Adult Educational enterprise ("a spirit released from classical school traditions and the fear of economic dictatorship in all our public affairs"). He regards the education enterprise as "one aspect of the last stand of traditional American democracy against the gathering forces of focalized economic power and privilege."

S. S. Olans of Dorchester, Massachusetts, didn't like Fred Rodell's "Arnold: Buster of Myths and Trusts" (June 22). He recommends Robert Lynd's "dissection of Arnold" in Science and Society.

What's on the Air?

Professor F. B. Cleland of Minnesota University interviews farmers, farm workers and their families on current problems, Sunday, August 14, 4 P.M., CBS.

World Youth Congress discussion on "Youth and the World of Tomorrow," Monday, August 15, 2:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network.

Third anniversary of the Social Security Act. Addresses by President Roosevelt, Senator Robert F. Wagner and Arthur J. Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board, Monday, August 15, 10:30 P.M., NBC-Blue Network, CBS and Mutual.

Musical and dramatic programs of the week include the Kreiner String Quartet, Saturday, August 13, 12 noon, NBC-Red Network; Lewisohn Stadium concert conducted by Massimo Freccia, Sunday, August 14, 8:30 P.M., CBS; "Hamlet" presented by the Mercury Theatre group, Monday, August 15, 9 P.M., CBS; "Actors' Blood," by Ben Hecht, Wednesday, August 17, 10 P.M., Mutual; "Strange Interlude," by Eugene O'Neill, Thursday, August 18, 9 P.M., NBC-Blue Network; and "Enoch Arden Afterwards," by Ray

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

National Card-Index

AMERICAN REGIONALISM" [1] is both enchanting and exasperating; it will set the normal, non-academic reader to dreaming and cursing by turns. One can spend long imaginative hours poring over its maps and charts; and its facts—facts about soil profiles, rural populations, the buying habits of New England, the number of people needed in a given area to support a hat shop, the tendency of industry to decentralize in search of a cheaper or more tractable labor market, etc., etc.—are endlessly stimulating. But the book's structure is enough to make anyone but a graduate student chew his nails down to the half-moons.

The authors admit that they have produced a "workshop" book—by which they mean that it is not only a book about the six major American regions but also a voluminous outline, almost a full seminar discussion, of what a good book on American regions should be. In their anxiety to cover every possible approach the Messrs. Odum and Moore remind you of a garrulous novelist who insists on weighting down a story by including long philosophical asides on the nature of his craft; and they prove indubitably that there are thirteen ways of looking at a blackbird. The thirteen ways, however, tend frequently to establish nothing more startling than the fact that a blackbird is both black and a bird, which we knew at first glance.

As very professorial professors, Odum and Moore must needs begin with an essay in elaborate and overspecialized definition. Stuart Chase is simpler: he has defined a region as "an area where nature acts in a roughly uniform manner." That will do for most purposes, but it doesn't account for a good deal of overlapping. Inasmuch as human needs and objectives enter into the equation, the need for a more flexible treatment of the subject is obvious. When one is talking about planning for flood control the whole Mississippi Valley must be treated as a single region, but when it is a matter of planning for agriculture no sane person would regard the corn belt and the cotton belt as part of the same division, even though they are both in the same valley. A good part of the first section of "American Regionalism" is devoted to stressing such important but readily perceptible points. The authors are also extremely careful to differentiate between natural regions, culture regions and service regions. All of this is useful stuff, but the normal reader will almost certainly be bored by the long parade of "authorities" which Odum and Moore assemble: the treatment constantly tends to be repetitious, and the same points could be made in at least half the space.

The second section of the book is an essay in approach. Here Odum and Moore "explore the region" with the geographers, the anthropologists, the ecologists, the economists, the political scientists and the sociologists. Much of this section is fascinating, particularly the chapter on the ecologists, whose science is that of the relation of organisms to their environment. But again the parade of authorities gets in the way of crisp writing: one longs for a book in which the author sets up his own definitions and chooses his own approach. Odum and Moore certainly prove that "every something is a number of somethings" (to use Professor Giddings' language), but there is no need to let everyone under the bibliographical sun have his way on each division, sub-division and sub-sub-division of every conceivable topic that can be raked together into one card-index system.

The real meat of "American Regionalism" is in part three; here Odum and Moore get around to a working blueprint of their regions and to an approach that forgets the frequently arbitrary distinctions between ecology and anthropology, political science and sociology. The six regions—"six Americas in search of a faith"—are "the middle states and their 'middle west,'" "the northeast and its New England," "the southeast and its 'Old South,'" "the far west and its California," "the northwest and its great plains," and "the southwest and its Texas." Unfortunately, Odum and Moore are victims in section three of everything that has gone before: material that has hitherto been used to illustrate the various definitions and the different approaches is now used all over again for purposes of description. One meets the same facts about Southern farms in "The Southeast and its 'Old South'" that one has met some four hundred pages back in the chapter on "Culture Regions: The Rural Nation." I realize the difficulties encountered by Odum and Moore, and I also realize that they aren't necessarily aiming for Stuart Chase's "Rich Land, Poor Land" audience, but there ought to be some way, even some *academic* way, of writing a book on regionalism-in-general and regions-in-particular without telling you the same facts on pages 140-141 that you get on page 543.

The structural clumsiness of "American Regionalism" is the book's chief defect. But there is also another defect, and that is a failure on the part of the authors to understand the ways of politics. The Messrs. Odum and Moore piously hope that "regionalism" will replace "sectionalism" in Congress, and that a maximum of social peace will result. But, as Donald Davidson has unsuccessfully urged upon Odum and Moore, sectionalism is the political face of regionalism. Sectionalism can be temperate or intemperate, but the regional politician who starts out with nothing other than the "good of the whole" in mind will soon find himself euchred out of his share in the good of the whole. Tolerance and the spirit of compromise are important to the functioning of democracy, particularly in a nation of six widely differentiated regions, but one doesn't arrive at a good compromise without putting up an initial fight. After all, it is the representative's business to represent; he is elected to present local demands—call them regional or sectional, as you will. It is only after local demands have

1 American Regionalism: A Cultural-Historical Approach to National Integration, by Howard W. Odum and Harry Estill

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and appeal that statesmanship can find a workable compromise between regions.

This review of "American Regionalism" has concentrated on the authors' methodology. Hence it is not a wholly fair review; there is more to the book than method. But it would be impossible within the confines of a page to do more than indicate the factual richness of "American Regionalism." As a matter of fact, the book needs as many critics of its content and its flavor as there are regions. I would like, for example, to see what Jonathan Daniels has to say about the Southern material, or what the Lynds think about the section on the middle states. Meanwhile I am certain that hundreds will want to own "American Regionalism" if only to use as a quarry—which means that Odum and Moore have fulfilled their pedagogical function even though they have been bad artists.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

Napoleon's Europe

Europe and the French Imperium: 1799-1814, by Geoffrey Bruun. New York: Harper and Brothers. 294 pages, illustrated. $3.75.

PROFESSOR BRUUN of New York University has written a book at once sound and fanciful. Drawing on a wealth of modern scholarship, he has synthesized skillfully the more significant political, social, economic and cultural movements of the age of Napoleon. His historical observations are frequently profound and always shrewd. France does not bound his vision, which roams impartially over the whole of Europe. We get a sense of the impact of French influence on neighboring countries and of the counter-revolutionary role of Great Britain in the years when her modern empire was taking concrete shape. All the important facts are there in fine marching order.

Unfortunately, the author has embroidered his excellent summary with a highly questionable interpretation of the French Revolution. The eighteenth century, it seems, strove more for administrative consolidation than for social equality and political democracy. "If Europe in the revolutionary age may be thought of as dominated by one nearly universal mood, that mood was an intense aspiration for order." Enlightened despotism was the political vehicle of this aspiration. The Revolution, with its "pseudo-anarchy," frustrated the general longing for order. Napoleon, by fulfilling it, proved himself the true heir of the Enlightenment. The heritage was a mixed blessing, for the doctrinaire rationalism and cosmopolitanism of the *philosophes* led him into the fatal error of ignoring national forces and differences and the European balance of power.

So interpreted, the Revolution becomes a perverse "deviation" acceptable only to "an intoxicated minority," while the Napoleonic interlude appears as the culmination of a century of popular striving. Brumaire stands forth as "a moral revolution" against a decade of "dangerous experiment," "perilous opportunism and incertitude." The French people did not take the same attitude; in fact they went to the trouble of rebelling every generation for a century in order to disprove the Bruun thesis that they had been prepared, in 1799, "to concede, like loyal Fascists in the making, popular representation," or "to sacrifice the ideal of democracy for a promise of peace and stability"—all to no avail. If, as Professor Bruun contends, "the most logical fulfillment of the *philosophes*' ideals was not the republicanism of the Jacobin commonwealth, but the despotism of the First Empire," that simply proves that the Revolution was the product of social conflict and not of philosophy at all.

Of course Professor Bruun knows better. The historian in him concludes that Napoleon betrayed the liberalism of the Revolution and enacted reactionary codes of law. He pleased the propertied peasants, helped the manufacturers, oppressed the workers, and worried many business men by his extreme mercantilism. His system, reactionary in a country which had made extraordinary strides since 1789, was progressive and revolutionary for a more backward continent. Yet Professor Bruun insists that Napoleon—and the Enlightenment and the moderate revolutionists as well—grew out of the same forces that today produce fascism, a movement equally reactionary abroad and at home. The effect is to make the moderate radicals of the eighteenth century kin to the Fascists, to minimize the progressive aspects of Napoleon's regime, and to represent fascism as inherent in modern society.

Professor Bruun seems to have been overimpressed by the easy theorizing that would justify the tendency toward totalitarianism by disparaging the social revolutions of the past. His book therefore "dates." He is too true to the conservatism of 1938 to be just to the radicalism of 1789. History has long ceased to be merely past politics; it should be wary of becoming *present* politics.

SOLOMON F. BLOOM

Fast Black and a Yard Wide

The Way Things Are, and Other Stories, by Albert Maltz. New York: International Publishers. $2.

PROLETARIANS have their fun, as well as their hard knocks, but you'd never suspect it reading these eight stories. The tone is set by yarn the first, which has an unemployed stiff of twenty-one dying in a Bowery flopjoint on New Year's Eve, to the racy chatter of his fellow outcasts—they almost, but not quite, save Maltz from proletarian maudlinity. (If it passes nowadays for proletarian tragedy, so much the worse.) Next, a funeral, and the daughter of the Polish steel hand cut in two by a falling girder, the sister of the youth going deaf in a nail mill, packing up and running away from home. A cop smashes the nose of a drunk. With proletarian misgivings, a father teaches his boy the game of cabbaging milk bottles off doorsteps: there is no money, and sister is sick, and she needs milk like anything. We jump to the case of the man on the road. He's dying of silicosis, contracted while helping dig a tunnel, and has left his family so as not to be a burden on them. In between, vigilantes kick hell out of some union farmers, sex hunger and the strain of running a drop forge combine to make life unbearable for a young man in Detroit, a Negro boy kills himself to escape a lynch mob.

Disease, degradation, death.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maltz to write about. Such a preoccupation with the black is unwholesome, obsessive, defeating its own purposes—for while the sympathy poured out over the underdogs is genuine enough, and open to respect, anybody who's ever been one himself must find this group portrait of said underdogs lopsided and, that being so, atypical.

And it's not an argument against The System that workers lost their lunchhooks, and even their lives, in the capitalistic mills. There are no drop forges in the USSR, no industrial accidents, no occupational diseases? The taunt (deserved) has become so hopeless a cliché that the Sunday reviewers of The New York Times have now taken it up, and a proletarian proseheimer of 1938 ought to know better than to leave himself open for it. As far back as 1930 Ezra Pound was saying that the proletarian short story was ripe for burlesque, its gloom had become so standardized. And Maltz, whose talent has little that is actually original, is close to parody: one step more and—horselaugh.

At which point the Literary Editor observes that Maltz is being smeared with a blacker brush than he (Maltz) uses on the poor old working class. "Give him a break." So very well. So we'll do that thing. So the idea is not to read the book at one fell sitting. Collectively the stories have an exasperating sameness of tone, but individually they move you, if you can be readily moved, and one of them (the aforementioned "Man on the Road") is, to quote the Literary Editor, "absolutely first rate. . . the best story The New Masses ever printed." FRED R. MILLER

Proust, Gide and Others

Four French Novelists, by Georges Lemaitre. New York: The Oxford University Press. 439 pages. $3.50.

THIS BOOK, consisting of essays on Proust, Gide, Giraudoux and Paul Morand, is to be recommended to every student of modern French literature. Professor Lemaitre is primarily interested in the philosophy of life of his subjects and how they came by it. He is less concerned with their relative literary merit. There are no comparisons with other writers. There are no final judgments. But there is ample understanding.

Lemaitre pictures Proust as having in his youth two great dreams: Society and Love. The first he sees as no mundane snobbery, but rather a literary passion culled from his reading of Saint-Simon's incisive pictures of the court of Louis XIV. The motif of love is traced to the hypochondriacal faith he placed in the children—and particularly the little girls—he felt so close to in his own childhood. In Lemaitre's words he was "the ever disappointed." But as his dreams crumbled he tried, like a scientist, to recover certain general laws. Thus his depiction of the disintegration of Society was not the breakdown of the old Faubourg Saint-Germain only; it was an inquiry into the laws by which all societies break down. And in the sphere of emotion Proust was interested not in the decline of any particular love relationship, but in unearthing the hidden inevitable laws by which all passions fade.

For to Proust love is doomed, since it "depends on the stances sufficient reason for being in love, how could the ego of today, which has altered, respond to past influences which are different." But though Lemaitre brings out so vividly Proust's scientific approach, he forgets it in comparing the original 1912 manuscript of the "Temps Perdu" with the final version revised and published a few years later. His point is that in the interim between the two publications Proust has become a sicker and a more bitter man, and that as a result he incorporated an almost morbid note of despair into the final version. But is this true? Wasn't it rather that Proust's whole world having collapsed during the War, he felt bound to record quite objectively a more disillusioned view of life?

Lemaitre's portrait of Gide is perfect. The essay is mainly devoted to Gide's lifelong struggle to resolve the conflict between the rigid Protestantism of his early training and an instinctive paganism that grew more insistent as he matured. Eventually he reconciled the two opposing doctrines by making a more flexible interpretation of religion. He came to believe that the true Christian life was for each individual to follow the dictates of his own nature: "*suivre sa pente en montant.*" This solution in its emphasis on the individual as the final criterion was, as Lemaitre points out, a truly Protestant one. The result in his work was that most of his books, written while he was still wavering between puritanism and paganism, are rather arbitrary embodiments first of one doctrine and then of the other, and hence express no one unified point of view. They are disconnected "fragments of reality." And in addition his characters, being personifications of abstract ideas, lack human warmth. Lemaitre sees in Gide's turn to communism a purely personal, sentimental wish-fulfillment for a freer, less hidebound society, and hence takes little stock either in Gide's first impulse or in his subsequent partial retraction.

The analyses of Morand and Giraudoux, though good, are inevitably less absorbing. You wonder why Lemaitre devoted the same amount of space and the same intensity of thought to these two far lesser writers as he did to Proust and Gide. NORMA MC CARTY

The House of Krupp

Blood and Steel: The Rise of the House of Krupp, by Bernhard Menne. Translated by G. H. Smith. New York: Lee Furman. 432 pages. $3.

BERNHARD MENNE contributes frequently to the emigré German press and got his start writing for Carl von Ossietzky's Weltbühne in the days of the Weimar Republic. Ernst Henri's "Hitler Over Europe" could hardly have been written without Menne's pioneer work in the same field; and the two men differ in their interpretation of Hitler's rise to power chiefly in Henri's emphasis upon Fritz Thyssen as "the man behind Hitler" as contrasted with Menne's preference for Krupp von Bohlen und Halbach. And Menne's history of the Krupp firm differs from "Blood, Iron and Profits," "Merchants of Death" and the other armaments exposés chiefly in the greater amount of detail it offers concerning the House of Krupp. It contains few new disclosures of outstanding im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attach to the rapidly increasing school of international muckrakers—the Ernst Henris, Frank Hanighens, Glyn Robertses, Claud Cockburns, Francis Delaisis, Roger Menneveés and George Seldeses who are playing a part today comparable to that played on the national scene by Lincoln Steffens and Ida Tarbell a generation ago—the most that anyone can say at any time for "Blood and Steel" is that it represents a great deal of conscientious effort. Perhaps the author distrusts sensationalism on the one hand and feels too modest to attempt any political philosophizing on the other. At any rate his laborious collection of rumors and surmises about the Krupp works makes grim reading. He accuses the Krupp management of profiteering, corruption, incompetence and reaction, and is so determined to represent its rise as a triumph of mediocrity that his book shares some of the more tedious defects of its subject matter.

QUINCY HOWE

British Imperialism in India

The White Sahibs in India, by Reginald Reynolds. New York: The John Day Company-Reynal and Hitchcock. 423 pages. $3.50.

MR. REGINALD REYNOLDS, who lived in India for several years and studied Indian conditions with sympathy and impartiality, presents a picture of British imperialism in India from the days of the East India Company up to the present time. "The White Sahibs of India" will upset many Americans who, as ardent believers in the British sense of justice, are advocates of Anglo-American coöperation in world politics. He exposes the economic policy of the East India Company—the "Bloody Scepter," which made Britain rich with the lifeblood of the Indian people—and of the British government, the purpose of which has been to serve the interests of British capitalists, especially Lancashire merchants, at the expense of the Indian people. The proposed changes in Indian administration do not materially change the basic character of the British rule.

The book gives a vivid picture of the real nature of the Indian revolt in 1857 and of British atrocities during and after the suppression of the Sepoy Mutiny. The chapters on "Indian Villages," "Indian Renaissance," "Depressed Classes of India," "Hindu-Moslem Problems," are worthwhile.

One may not agree with some of the conclusions of Mr. Reynolds, yet it must be recognized that the author speaks with authority, because every assertion in the book is backed up by a document and a reliable reference. According to him, it is a mockery to speak of British democracy as the hope of human rights, when British imperialism, supported by the British Parliament, enslaves and robs more than 350,000,000 people in India. Mr. Reynolds thinks that the solution of Indian problems will ultimately lead to a social revolution; and therefore Indian nationalism will have to adapt itself to programs which will better the condition of the masses. He does not believe that the Communists in India would be able to help the Indian masses; but he hopes much from Indian Socialists, who form the left wing of the All-India National Congress. The statistical and technical discussion of German forpendence that they should not expect any help from British liberals or radicals or even a British "Popular Front" government:

> This is the worst danger that attaches to a possible "Popular Front" government in Britain. The ostensible object of such a front would be to "defend democracy"; yet no one imagines that it would do anything of the sort. It would defend parliamentarism in Britain, and possibly the political rights of 46,000,000 people in the United Kingdom; but at the same time and with equal energy it would defend in India a system which is the antithesis of democracy. In short, in order to preserve limited rights for themselves, the British workers would be supporting the enslavement of a population about eight times as numerous. This is precisely the principle which the Socialist denounces in the capitalist system, which preserves the "rights" of privileged classes at the cost of the masses.

The book will startle those who believe in British civil liberties because, under cover of "preservation of law and order," tens of thousands of Indian nationalists have been placed in prison without the formality of any trial. Its publication in the United States will not only help to spread the truth about India among intelligent Americans of all ranks—especially those interested in world affairs and Oriental politics; it will also be a warning to British imperialists, who are seeking Anglo-American coöperation in world politics. It is to be hoped that this work will be extensively used as a reference book by all educational institutions where the problems of imperialism, colonial administration and nationalism are studied. The writing is very simple, the style direct; and it will help scholars as well as laymen to understand the underlying social, economic and political forces behind the rising tide of nationalism in India.

TARAKNATH DAS

Forest Primeval

German Forestry, by Franz Heske. New Haven: Yale University Press. 342 pages. $3.

THE ONLY JUSTIFICATION for reviewing this book for lay readers is its too obvious attempt to indoctrinate the conservation movement in this country with Nazi ideology. It also reveals how this philosophy works out in actual practice in such a field as forestry.

The idea of the book originated with one of the *selected* groups of American lumbermen and foresters who for the last four or five years have been visiting Germany and Austria as "fellows" of the Oberlaender Trust. Dr. Heske, a professor at the forest school at Tharandt, who acted on most of these visits as director, guide and "interpreter," has undertaken to interpret German forest policies for the people "in the United States and other countries which are in the early stages of forest conservation." This interpretation, originally written in German, has been translated into English by Professor A. B. Recknagel of Cornell University, edited by W. N. Sparhawk of the United States Forest Service, prefaced by Henry S. Graves, dean of the Yale School of Forestry, and supplied with an introduction by R. B. Goodman, a forest-land owner.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

greater natural resources. It is the discussion of forest policies which holds the greatest interest.

Dr. Heske is an ardent defender of private ownership of forests, particularly "entailed" forests—in other words, the large manorial estates which Republican Germany tried vainly to break up. Such ownership, together with the rigid fixity of occupation, fixity of residence and fixity of remuneration of rural workers, marks practically a return to the feudal system. In the place of trade unions, collective bargaining, etc., Dr. Heske extols the abstract concept of "individual enterprise as a social organism" and the principle of leadership. He frankly admits that the principle of leadership means that "all power to make decisions resides in the leader of the enterprise—the employer."

How well the "leader principle" has worked out may be gained from the fact that in the woods industry, for instance, the average hourly rate of wages for skilled labor, male and female, has dropped from 111.2 *Reichspfennigs* in 1931 to 79.3 *Reichspfennigs* in 1936. For unskilled labor, it has been reduced from 91.3 *Reichspfennigs* in 1931 to 62 *Reichspfennigs* in 1936. (These figures are quoted from the National Industrial Conference Board's report, "Economic Development of Germany under National Socialism," study No. 236, pages 33-60.)

Dr. Heske's paradise is thus nothing more than feudal serfdom. It is, therefore, somewhat understandable why American forest-owners would be interested in having this interpretation of German forest conditions made available to American foresters. Why foresters, however—some of them high in the public service—should be active participants in putting over this new ideology, is much more difficult to understand or to explain.

RAPHAEL ZON

New Books: A Reader's List

SUWANNEE RIVER, by Cecile Hulse Matschat (Farrar and Rinehart, $2.50). A handsome addition to the Rivers of America Series, edited by Constance Lindsay Skinner. As lush as the river itself, but nevertheless a good book of its kind. There is more anthropology than mammy-spirit in it.

ANNALS OF THE SWEDES ON THE DELAWARE: 1792-1863, by Jehu Curtis Clay (John Ericsson Memorial Committee, $3). Jehu Curtis Clay was a Swedish clergyman who wrote about the Atlantic Coast settlers. It is an interesting journal, full of robust piety and purpose.

RUMANIAN JOURNEY, by Sacheverell Sitwell (Scribner's, $3.50). A pleasant but not exceptional travel diary, full of Baedeker commonplaces and tourist oh's, ah's and a rather sickly gentility: "The resemblance of King Carol to the Hanoverian family is striking and, if I may say so, is of comfort to an Englishman." But you won't find anything about fascism in the index. The photographs are superb.

THE DANUBE FLOWS THROUGH FASCISM, by William Van Til (Scribners, $3). A restless couple scorn the conventional tourist props of Baedekers and sight-seeing busses, and instead get inside Europe by paddling down the Danube in a kayak. A medley of travel book remarks from natives on the sidelines and gratitude for American

PEOPLE AT BAY: The Jewish Problem in East-Central Europe, by Oscar I. Janowsky (Oxford, $1.75). Professor Janowsky's report to the Council on Jewish Relations. Scholarly, quiet, studded with facts, it is probably the most authoritative contemporary work on the problems and the unchanging *via dolorosa* of the five and a half million Jews who live in the terror region between Germany and Russia.

WATERWAY, by Eleanor Dark (Macmillan, $2.50). In one day in a suburb across the harbor from Sydney, Australia, a group of people reach the point of crisis and decision in their private worlds. A vivid and terrifying ferry accident rearranges life somewhat too patly for some of them, but the story has emotional power and psychological acuteness.

STOREVIK, by Gosta af Geijerstam (Dutton, $2). Sketches of family life on a Norwegian island, describing the artless highlights of everyday fishing, hunting, haymaking, etc. Simple home-cooking.

OLD MOTLEY, by Audrey Lucas (Macmillan, $2.50). About a young Puritan whose debut on the stage is the cue for family curses, mild shock and extraordinary success. A detailed and pleasant resurrection of early nineteenth-century London, set up for the sake of a plot that has grown rusty with age and continual service.

DIVIDE BY TWO, by Mildred Gilman (Harcourt, Brace, $2). A thirteen-year-old boy whose divorced parents have each remarried goes berserk in a desperate effort to restore the lost unity of his home. A shrewd and sympathetic tale, told with humor. Good satirical comment upon the hypocrisies of "liberal" parents.

PITY THE PERSECUTOR, by Julius Gordon (Richard R. Smith, $2). An approach to Nazi anti-Semitism from a new angle: "seeing the persecutor as the victim behind the victim," by listing Germany's social and cultural losses as a result of her Jewish persecution.

Contributors

JONATHAN DANIELS is editor of the Raleigh, North Carolina, News and Observer. He is the author of "A Southerner Discovers the South," published in July by the Macmillan Company.

LEGARDE S. DOUGHTY lives in Augusta, Georgia. He has contributed poems and articles to some thirty publications.

LOUIS GIBARTI is a journalist, Hungarian by birth, now living in Paris.

HAROLD WARD's special interest is in the social implications of technology and science. He is a contributing editor of *China Today*.

SOLOMON F. BLOOM teaches Modern European History at Brooklyn College. He is writing a book on Marx and nationalism.

FRED R. MILLER of Brooklyn is a dealer in rare "hot" records, an erstwhile short-story writer and the former editor of Blast.

NORMA MCCARTY has been writing articles in England, where she has been living for the past four years.

QUINCY HOWE is head of the editorial department of Simon and Schuster and the author of "World Politics" and "England Expects Every American to Do His Duty."

RAPHAEL ZON, professor of Forestry at the University of Minnesota, has been for twenty-five years editor of The Journal of Forestry.

TARAKNATH DAS, Ph.D., a journalist and an expert on Indian affairs, is the author of "Foreign Policy in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED